DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 023 JC 930 219

AUTHOR Clough, Carol E.
TITLE Improving Staff Development in South County Community College District, California.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 281p.; Ed.D. research project, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
-- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Educational Needs; Employee Attitudes; *Faculty Development; Inservice Education; *Needs Assessment; *Professional Development; Professional Recognition; Questionnaires; School Surveys; *Staff Development; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Chabot College CA; *Las Positas College CA

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to investigate staff development needs at Chabot College and Las Positas College as perceived by members of the faculty, administration, and classified staff; to develop strategies to address the perceived needs; and to recommend short- and long-term implementation plans. A Staff Development Needs Assessment Questionnaire, an eight-page instrument designed specifically for the study, was administered to the 745 full- and part-time administrators, faculty, and classified staff at the colleges. The questionnaire asked about demographic information; opinions about the colleges' organizational operating environment; willingness to participate in workshops focused on meeting changing institutional needs, developing academic and technical knowledge and skills, and personal development; preferred workshop times; and personal achievements in professional development. Study findings, based on 577 responses, included the following: (1) administrator, faculty, and staff respondents wanted more computer-related information/skills and information on methods for improving service to or working with culturally diverse people; (2) 91% of the respondents felt that the institution should encourage and facilitate development and continuous learning of personnel, but only 44% felt that the district was providing that environmental tone and support; (3) administrators expressed most interest in workshops on problem-solving strategies, team building, and priority setting; and (4) 80% of the faculty and classified staff perceived salary incentives for participation in staff development as important, compared to 58% of the administrators. A review of the literature, recommendations for a Human Resource Development Model for the colleges, and appendixes containing college mission statements and the survey instrument and responses are included. (Contains 446 references.) (MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED356023

IMPROVING STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

by

Carol E. Clough, M.B.A.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. E. Clough

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Major Applied Research Project presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University

February, 1991

JC 930219

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As a student in the Programs for Higher Education at Nova University, I do (✓ do not ( ) give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this Major Applied Research Project on request from interested parties. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination other than to cover the costs of duplicating, handling, and mailing of the materials.

February 7, 1991 — (date)

Carol E. Clough — Carol E. Clough

I certify that I have read and am willing to sponsor this Major Applied Research Project submitted by Carol E. Clough. In my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards and is fully adequate in scope and quality as a Major Research Project for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

February 12, 1991 — (date)

Frederick C. Kintzer — Frederick C. Kintzer, Ed.D.
MARP Advisor

I certify that I have read this Major Applied Research Project and in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards for a Major Applied Research Project for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

February 14, 1991 — (date)

Mauro Chavez — Mauro W. Chavez, Ed.D.
Local Committee Member

This Major Applied Research Project was submitted to the Central Staff of Programs for Higher Education of Nova University and is acceptable as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

June 12, 1991 — (date)

Ross E. Moreton — Ross E. Moreton, Ed.D.
Central Staff Committee Member

Abstract of a Major Applied Research Project Presented to Nova University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

IMPROVING STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

by

Carol E. Clough, M.B.A.

February, 1991

California's legislature passed AB 1725, an assembly bill that was aimed at reforming the state's community college system. This 1988 bill mandated staff development activities and funded them statewide with five million dollars per year. In order to receive the monies allotted to districts on an ADA (Average Daily Attendance) basis, the institutions were required to (1) establish an advisory committee with administrators, faculty, and classified staff, (2) survey the personnel regarding their perceptions of staff development needs, and (3) develop a Human Resource Development Plan. A yearly report of staff development activities that are funded from the general fund and from the AB 1725 fund is prepared for the California Community College Chancellor's Office.

The purpose of this Major Applied Research Project was (1) to investigate staff development needs as perceived by the faculty, administration, and classified staff of Chabot

College and Las Positas College; (2) to develop strategies to address the perceived needs; and (3) to recommend short-term and long-term implementation plans for the colleges and district in supplementing the traditional offerings for faculty and staff development.

This study provided answers to the following research questions: (1) What information and skills through various activities are needed (and wanted) by faculty and staff to update/upgrade dissemination of information and interfacing of communications in order to meet the missions of the colleges among the multicultural segments? (2) What incentives are wanted by faculty and staff to motivate them to update/upgrade their perceived staff development needs within the context of the organizational operating environment? (3) What type of organizational operating climate does the faculty and staff perceive in relationship to support of staff development?

The literature was searched for an appropriate questionnaire; none was found. Contacts through the California Community College Chancellor's Office and the California Community College Council for Staff Development provided questionnaires devised and used by other colleges. The South County Community College District's Staff Development Council decided that the instruments reviewed did not completely serve its intents and purposes; consequently, an eight-page instrument was developed. The Staff Development Needs Assessment Questionnaire was administered

to 775 full-time and part-time administrators, faculty, and classified staff. The 577 responses were representative of the three segments of population of the two colleges in the district.

The findings indicated that the staff development needs of the three segments interfaced on various topics and activities. All three segments wanted more information and skills on computers. To support this area, faculty and classified staff perceived a high need for a Staff Resource Center at both colleges. All three segments were interested in methods for improving either service to or working with culturally diverse people. Three fourths of the segments perceived meetings with counterparts at the second college as important. Seventy percent or more of the administrators, faculty, and classified staff perceived visitations to appropriate units at other community colleges, local universities, and private or public organizations as needed. The three segments were only three percent apart in their 91 percent agreement that the organization should encourage and facilitate development and continuous learning of personnel in successfully meeting its mission and goals. Only 44 percent of the three segments perceived the district of providing that environmental tone and support.

The findings indicated that there are differences of staff development needs both among and within the three personnel constituencies. The administrators perceived

their highest needs for workshops related to meeting changing institutional needs through such areas as problem solving strategies, team-building, and priority setting. The classified staff rated this area second highest and the faculty last. The classified staff expressed the highest needs for information and strategies to deal with health and nutrition. Eighty percent of the faculty and classified staff perceived salary incentives important for participation in staff development compared to fifty-eight percent of the administration.

In the process of working together during the past year, the Staff Development Council determined that the isolation of the segments, which has characterized the colleges, needed to be changed. As a result, the council has promoted topics and activities that involve administrators, faculty, and classified staff as much as their interests allow.

The following eleven recommendations, which evolved from the findings of the needs assessment, directed the formulation of a human resource development model for the district that incorporated the inter-segmental concept. (1) The administratively-controlled concept of the present two-day New Faculty Orientation before classes start into a collegial induction process that includes pre-service and at least two-years of in-service training. (2) The two-hour, one-time New Part-time Faculty Orientation should be expanded and systematized to cover a year. (3) Mentor

programs for new and continuing administrators, full-time and part-time faculty, and full-time and part-time classified staff should be established. (4) In-house workshops and other human resource development activities should be available and operating year round. (5) In-house workshops can be held either generically with the emphasis on collegial interaction or specifically with concentration on particular information and/or skills development of one sector. (6) Visitations to other community colleges, universities, and local public/private organizations can serve as an alternative to group activities. (7) Multiple alternatives and opportunities need to be made to these adult learners so that the learners can customize, professionalize, and personalize the development of information and skills that they need. (8) Resources of local universities can be utilized to provide extension and regular courses on topics relevant to community college personnel. (9) A Resource Center for personnel should be developed and maintained in the Learning Resource Centers at each college. (10) The pay schedules of the personnel segments should be reviewed to supplement them with continuous reward for participation in staff development activities of all types. (11) The function of staff development should be institutionalized by including it on the organizational chart under an area such as Personnel or Institutional Planning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Significance	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Major Issues and Research Questions	16
Definition of Terms	17
Limitations of the Study	18
Assumptions	18
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	19
Relating Staff Development to Mission and Goals	20
Types of Needs Assessment or Analysis Instruments	24
Development of a Survey Instrument	32
Perspectives on Faculty and Staff Development	34
Components of Staff Development Programs	85
3. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY	100
Design of the Study	100
Questionnaire Design and Development	101
Layout and Content of the Needs Assessment Instrument	104

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Page

Population Studied 106

Data Collection 108

Data Analysis 111

Summary 113

4. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 114

Rate of Return 115

Research Questions 116

Questionnaire Analysis 116

Summary 176

5. INTERPRETATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 177

Summary of the Study 177

Findings of the Study 178

Conclusions 188

Recommendations for a Human Resource Development Model 190

Recommendations for Further Study 192

Diffusion and Implementation 195

BIBLIOGRAPHY 196

APPENDIXES

A. CHABOT COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT, 1988-89 . . 232

B. STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM, 1988-89 234

C. SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 1989-90 238

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Page

D. SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM, 1989-90 247

E. MISSION, PHILOSOPHY, AND OBJECTIVES OF LAS POSITAS COLLEGE, 1990 252

F. RESPONSES FROM STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT, SECTION E: PART I 254

G. RESPONSES FROM STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT, SECTION E: PART II 260

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF STUDENT 263

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Questionnaire Return By Segment	115
2.	Respondent's Primary Worksite	117
3.	Respondent's Type of Position	118
4.	Respondent's Primary Day or Evening Assignment	118
5.	Respondent's Classification of Position	119
6.	Respondent's Years of Service in District	120
7.	Respondents by Area of Assignment	121
8.	Respondent's Sex	122
9.	Respondent's Age	123
10.	Respondent's Highest Certificate or Degree Earned	124
11.	Respondent's Prior Place of Employment	125
12.	Results of Perceptions Regarding the Importance of Organizational Promotion of Staff Development in Meeting Community College Missions and Goals	126
13.	Results of Perceptions of the Degree that the College Provides a Supporting Environment for Personnel	127
14.	Results of Perceptions of the Degree that the College Encourages Personnel to Participate in Matters that Directly Affect Their Jobs	129
15.	Results of Perceptions of the Degree that the Organization Provides Timely Feedback	130
16.	Results of Perceptions that the Organization Supports Teamwork	131

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

Table		Page
17.	Results on the Probability of Participation in Workshops on Strategies for Effective Meetings	133
18.	Results of Interest in Participation in Workshops on Dealing with Stress and Team-building	134
19.	Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Solving Problems and Working with People	135
20.	Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Setting Division/Area Goals and Priorities	136
21.	Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Leadership and Communication Techniques	137
22.	Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Employee Relations and Managerial Practices	138
23.	Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Hiring Practices and Affirmative Action	139
24.	Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Multiculturizing the Curriculum	140
25.	Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Ways to Deal with a Multicultural Population	141
26.	Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Techniques for Improving Student Retention	142
27.	Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Peer Review from Other Community Colleges	143
28.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops on Reports of Employees Returning from a conference, Sabbatical, or Leave of Absence	144

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

Table		Page
29.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops on Grant Writing to Develop Ideas into Formal Action	145
30.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops to Train on Writing for Publication. . . .	145
31.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops on Developing Presentations for Workshops and Conferences	146
32.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops on Sharing New Findings in Subject Areas	146
33.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops to Learn DIALOG to Utilize Educational Literature Research	147
34.	Aggregate Responses to Monthly or Quarterly Lunches or Dinners with Speakers on Education or World Issues . .	148
35.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops on the Development of Technical Knowledge and Skills	149
36.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops on the Improvement of Teaching and Student Services	151
37.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops on the Development of the Whole Person	153
38.	Aggregate Responses to Workshops to Interactive Activities	154
39.	Aggregate Responses to Motivators for Participating in Staff Development Activities.	157
40.	Aggregate Responses to Workshop Times	160
41.	Responses to Replacing an Instruction Day with a Staff Development Day	161

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

Table		Page
42.	Number of Flex Days Wanted by Respondents	162
43.	Number of Conferences and Workshops that Respondents Paid More Than Two-thirds of the Cost During the Past Two Years	163
44.	Number of Conferences and Workshops Attended in Past Two Years that District Paid Most of the Cost	164
45.	Number of Staff Development Activities Respondent Had Participated in Since Spring, 1989	165
46.	Number of Community College Courses Respondent Had Taken for Credit During the Past Two Years	166
47.	Number of University Courses on Any Topic Respondent Had Taken for Credit During the Past Two Years	167
48.	Number of Institutional Projects or Grants that Respondent Had Participated in During the Past Two Years	168
49.	Number of Books, Articles, or Papers that Respondent Had Prepared in the Past Two Years	169
50.	Number of Presentations of Various Types that Respondent Personally Participated in During the Past Two Years	170
51.	Results on University Courses Taken	171
52.	Respondent's Interest in University Courses	173

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background and Significance

The Problem in California

During the twentieth century, the California legislature has provided policy leadership in the development of postsecondary educational opportunities as the state's population doubled every twenty years and the economy expanded. Although the public junior college originated in the eastern United States in the early 1900s (Gleazer, 1968 and Ratcliff, 1986), California was the first to legislate the establishment of junior colleges in 1917 (Vaughan, 1984:25). In 1921, the legislature funded an organization of independent junior college districts that would provide open admissions for academic (transfer) and vocational programs, while maintaining state-level control of faculty credentialing (Koos, 1925).

In addition, the legislature provided for two university systems. Senate Bill 33 in 1960 passed a Master Plan of postsecondary education that differentiated the missions of the three segments--University of California, California State Colleges (now Universities), and the Junior/Community Colleges (Hendrick, 1980:61-65). In 1984, the California legislature passed three bills--AB 1570,

SB 2064, and ACR 162--to provide for a review of the Master Plan of Higher Education in California.

Various groups did studies to provide a data base of information and recommendations for funding and programs. Under the funding of the 1986 Budget Act, Berman and Weiler (1988) performed a study of the faculty development activities of the three segments of higher education for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges in its 1985 Basic Agenda catalogued the following seven concerns regarding faculty: (1) attrition in full-time instructors, (2) part-time instructors, (3) tenure, (4) affirmative action, (5) currency of instructors, (6) salaries, and (7) aging workforce and morale. A key concern concentrated on the abilities of faculty to continue to deliver quality teaching and learning experiences for students. The report (Board of Governors, 1985:56) stated that

> the perception has become more prevalent within recent years that instructors are not staying up-to-date in their fields. Reasons cited for this perception include lifetime credentialing, the lack of continuing education requirements, and the lack of staff development and in-service training.

Concerns, such as those expressed by the Board of Governors about community college personnel, were presented at hearings, debated by various associations, and developed into positions and recommendations. Final recommendations were incorporated into the 1988 law of AB 1725.

Section 5 of AB 1725 mandated and funded staff development for faculty, admininstration, and classified staff. The legislation delineated the operational requirements that each district must address in order to receive funding. They include (1) establishing an advisory committee with administrators, faculty, and staff, (2) making a needs assessment of faculty and staff development needs, and (3) preparing a human development resources plan for the current year.

The Problem in the South County Community College District

The South County Community College District and Chabot College with two campuses at Hayward and Livermore have been synonomous from 1961 through 1989. In 1989, the Livermore site was acknowledged by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges as a separate college, named Las Positas College. Chabot College was one of the new colleges of the 1960s; it started classes in 1961. The Livermore Campus opened its doors in 1975 with a transfer of faculty and administration from the main campus (Staniford, 1981:64). The 1960s and early 1970s were growing years for the district, just as they were expanding years for most California community college districts. Proposition 13 in 1978, which limited funding and influenced the reduction of students and staff in the early 1980s, changed the environments at both campuses.

Prior to the implementation of the staff development component of AB 1725, the last comprehensive college or district report on staff development was completed in 1976 (Mertes, 1976). It focused on professional development of the faculty, a common practice in the 1970s. Cervero (1988:76) explained that "each specific institution has a unique set of values and resources and a particular history and culture." These became more evident during the ensuing years, in spite of 1977 Board of Trustees policy on Affirmative Action which included the only statement on Staff Development and Training Activities among board policies. The issue of professional development of the faculty seemed to be assumed through the internal funding of new faculty orientation days, the annual orientation day of new and returning faculty, conferences, sabbaticals, and salary schedule with horizontal columns rewarding university units and degrees earned. The professional development of administration seemed to be assumed through internal funding of orientation days, conferences, and an annual two-day retreat. Training and development of classified staff was obscure, once individuals were introduced to the location of their job. Staff development was inculcated as an individual concern and responsibility; the institution only existed to serve students, as stated in its mission statement (Appendix A).

In 1982, campus committees and a district (college) council were established for Professional Development by

the Superintendent/President of the South County Community College District. This system of professional development included four committees: a faculty committee at the Hayward campus, a faculty committee at the Livermore campus, an across-the-college committee of classified staff, and a common committee for administrative staff. The Professional Development Council included the chairs and vice-chairs, as well as the administrative resource person from each committee. Since the district had one-college status at the initiation year of AB 1725, it was determined that this council met the advisory committee requirement with the change of adding a separate committee for classified staff at the new Las Positas College.

The members of the Council decided that until the needs assessment study was completed, its human resource development plan would be based on the concept of "training by demand" (Caplette, 1988:53). The plan allowed individual employees to identify staff development needs by proposing projects on a standardized form, based upon the criteria developed through the committees and Council that were included on the 1988-89 proposal form (Appendix B). Projects were reviewed, approved, and prioritized first by peers at the committee level and then by the Council.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is that the AB 1725 legislation required a staff development needs assessment. A formal staff

development needs assessment had never been made of the personnel of the two campuses and off-site centers within the twenty-nine year history of the South County Community College District in Alameda county. This lack of institutional research to serve as the basis for planning and study within a two-year public college is not unusual (Roueche and Boggs, 1968). During the evaluation process of the 1988-89 staff development activities, the district's Staff Development Council recognized the importance of doing a needs assessment that encompassed all levels of personnel. It approved funding for a one-third reassigned time Staff Development Coordinator for the 1989-90 school year from the AB 1725 funding and itemized that task of doing a needs assessment in the job description. The newly elected chair of the Council emphasized the importance that the Staff Development Coordinator prepare and implement the needs assessment instrument in 1989-90.

National Concerns of Personnel Development

Since the founding of the first junior college in Illinois in 1907, different states have taken different approaches to integrating it within their educational systems. Some states have kept its transfer function as the primary mission. Various states, such as Virginia, have established separate occupational-technical colleges for vocational education (Townsend, 1984:5). Other states, like California, have formulated a comprehensive college that entails both goals. In many states, the two-year

colleges, like those in California, also have expanded missions to provide remedial education, community services, English as a Second Language, and open access to adults.

These expanding missions, combined with a more ethnically and educationally diverse population, have fostered extensive growth in numbers of students and numbers of two-year colleges. In turn, they have challenged administrators, faculty, and classified staff in meeting new and changing demands. Gaff (1978:85) and Siegel (1980) characterized the 1960s as a decade of "student development" with "'new' students, 'nontraditional' students, and 'underprepared' students." They denoted the 1970s as the decade for faculty development, as the slackened pace of growth of students broadened to include more diversity among ethnic groups and students' age and gender. The external force that promoted preparation and in-service development of faculty and administrators for the 1970s to address the challenges of non-traditional students was the 1968 Educational Professions Development Act funded by the federal government (Cohen and Roueche, 1969).

The hopes of faculty development at the national level in the 1970s, then, was to respond to these continuing changes "by bringing about changes within institutions, and . . . potentially addressing their needs for flexibility, efficiency, and effectiveness" (Gaff, 1978:85-86). In response to this national legislation, Florida was the leading state in funding a percentage (5%) of its

Florida was the leading state in funding a percentage (5%) of its state-level financial assistance for staff development (Gleazer, 1973:235).

Many colleges and universities established or expanded such areas as teaching improvement centers, faculty evaluation programs, and curriculum innovation. Bergquist and Phillips (1975 and 1977) prepared comprehensive handbooks on faculty development to include instructional development, organizational development, and personal development. Centra's (1976) national study showed that more than half of the United States postsecondary institutions had established faculty development programs. Smith's (1981) national study during 1980 indicated approximately the same percentage of staff development programs. Patrick and Caruthers' (1979) national study of priorities found that community college presidents placed providing for faculty renewal and vitality as their second highest priority. It appeared that higher education was dealing with the concerns.

Meanwhile, major changes were affecting the general workplace. While growth in enrollments in postsecondary education had declined between 1970-1980, the civilian labor force grew by thirty-one percent. The context of the workforce had altered, too, with the increase in women and an eighty-five percent increase of college graduates, rising from ten million in 1970 to nineteen million in 1980. This more educated workforce influenced the pace of

accelerated, along with a structural shift from primarily a manufacturing-based economy to a service-oriented economy (Ehrenhalt, 1983:17-23).

The impact of these changes on people and the implications for education are reflected by Neher and Hauser (1982:53):

> And what a today it is when the half-life of a graduating engineer's usable knowledge is estimated at five to seven years, when the career of a 20-year-old is destined for major redirection every 10 years, when the "Pepsi Generation," now 35 years old, is continually relearning for jobs that did not exist 10 years ago and when the task of staging learning has shifted from the schools to the training rooms of business and industry.

Bloom (1973:110) predicted that "Increasingly, learning throughout life (continuing learning) would be necessary for the largest proportion of the work force." Meierhenry (1970:153) stated that

> One grave problem in all professional fields today is how practitioners are to be kept up-to-date about new content, methods, and practices. Teachers are not exceptions to this rule. . . The massiveness of the in-service task taxes all existent ways of meeting this problem.

It became apparent during the 1970s that personnel in all professions and occupations, including education, were going to need additional educating or training in order not to become obsolete in thinking and performing.

But, were the staff development activities of the 1970s helping faculty adapt enough to the changing world? In 1982, futurist John Naisbitt in Megatrends warned that "As our school systems fail us, corporations will become

the universities of the future." According to Carnevale (1983:6), the trend of the 1980s was "a shift in institutional authority away from public and nonprofit institutions toward the private sector." Beer, et al., (1984:4-6) provided eight reasons why human resource management emerged in organizations in the United States during recent years. The reasons included

1. Increasing international competition;
2. Increasing complexity and size;
3 Slower growth;
4. Greater government involvement;
5. Increasing education of the work force;
6. Changing values of the work force;
7. More concern with career and life satisfaction;
8. Changes in work force demography.

The American Society for Training and Development (1989:3) concluded that

> Schools no longer carry the whole burden of educating people for work. . . . There is a much larger learning enterprise in this country made up of the nation's employers, both public and private. Together they spend nearly $210 billion annually on informal and formal training for the nation's workforce. This large, shadowy learning system is the nation's major supplier of work-related learning to adults, serving more people than does the entire higher education system.

The relatively new entrance of business and industry into substantial, continuing training has impact on the nation's postsecondary institutions, particularly the community colleges, through changing student enrollments, challenges

to institutional adaptability, and need for faculty and staff development on a continuing basis.

Various writers of postsecondary education have studied and/or criticized the lack of emphasis that colleges have placed on continued staff development for their faculty and staff. Cohen and Brawer (1987:83) pointed out that faculty rated lifelong education and occupational studies as an important function of the community college. Cervero (1988:2) reported that "most professions now embrace the importance of lifelong professional education." Kelly (1987:2) remonstrated that "because colleges are advocates of the development of human potential for students, it is ironic that developing the human capital of the faculty is virtually ignored in most institutions." Bender and Lukenbill (1984:16) reflected that

> community and technical colleges are recognized as a primary force in the nation's human resource and economic development. Yet these same institutions have not responded to their own human resource development needs.

Colleges have not focused on training their own employees even though eighty percent of their budgets are allocated to human resources (Bush and Ames, 1984:25).

The literature reflected that the community colleges did not foster the development of their staffs during the 1970s. Richardson (1975:304) deplored the lack of staff development conceptualized frameworks that provide organizational development as well as individual development. Dziuba-Malick (1988:9-11) referred to several writers of

the 1970s who criticized the "dismal," "ineffective," and "outright primitive" faculty inservice training programs.

Matters had not changed by the 1980s. Although writers have referred to community colleges as "teaching" institutions, the real support of the concept has not been administratively supported or strongly financially supported with training. Eble (1972) charged that a formal staff development program is an indication of an institution's commitment to quality in teaching. Case (1985:84) reflected that "comprehensive in-service staff development programs that effectively improve instruction are rare." Novotney (1986:51) described the common threads of concern among the community college system of the United States as

> the problems of a "graying" faculty, a changing student body both in terms of academic preparation and course interests, the impact of technology, and the fast changing needs of industry.

To supplement those institutional problems, there has been a lack of professional development for administrators (McDade, 1987:78). Bender and Lukenbill (1984:17) analyzed state documents; they concluded that the documents did not reveal "any national pattern or trend relevant to the human resource development of community college personnel." Most community colleges were not addressing the needs of their human capital.

To address these national and statewide concerns, the California legislature no longer left staff development to chance in the passage of AB 1725. It mandated human

operational requirements and specified the authorized uses for the monies it funded. The following nine items from AB 1725 set the parameters for human resource planning and development:

1. Improvement of teaching;

2. Maintenance of current academic and technical knowledge and skills;

3. In-service training for vocational education and employment preparation;

4. Retraining to meet changing institutional needs;

5. Intersegmental exchange programs;

6. Development of innovations in instructional and administrative techniques and program effectiveness;

7. Computer and technological proficiency programs;

8. Courses and training implementing affirmative action and upward mobility programs;

9. Other activities determined to be related to educational and professional development pursuant to criteria established by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges, including, but not necessarily limited to, programs designed to develop self-esteem.

Faculty/staff development programs differ among institutions in order to address the particular needs of the institution and the needs of the individuals of the institution (Belker, 1983; Lacey, 1983; Carleo, 1985; Petrovich and Hexter, 1986; Hall and Petrie, 1987; and

Lorenzo, 1990). The AB 1725 legislation left the determination of the kinds of projects and activities to be undertaken to the local colleges.

The South County Community College Solution

To address the requirements of the AB 1725 legislation, the Staff Development Council worked as a whole and then through a task force to recommend additional criteria for staff development activities. In 1988-89, the Council, with the encouragement of the Acting Superintendent/President, decided not to allocate the funds among the three main sectors--administration, faculty, and classified staff--on a FTE (Full Time Equivalent) basis with part-timers being factored into the whole. Instead the Council established a proposal process that was open to any employee. One deadline date for all proposals was set for March 21, 1989. Each peer committee evaluated and recommended to fund or not to fund, based on priorities. During the summer of 1989, the Council met to review and evaluate its process. The result was that the proposal form was redesigned (Appendix D) in order to facilitate proposer completion as well as committee and council review for funding. The Council also determined that there would be six deadlines throughout the school year with the realization that the internal approval process took three weeks and that the Board approval process took another month.

During its 1989-90 Accreditation Study, the two colleges of the district examined the shared mission

statement, philosophy, and objectives in terms of its legal and traditional role as a comprehensive community college. Las Positas applied a collegial process to the development of a separate text for the mission statement, philosophy, and objectives (Appendix E) with the majority of committee members being faculty. Although Chabot College's collegial review committee inferred the opportunities, the Las Positas committee purposefully included staff development as an important objective in promoting the college as a learning place with an inquiring-mind environment.

Both colleges replaced the long-standing word "students" with "individuals" in order to broaden the concept of institutional learning and service. In these ways, the personnel of both colleges have utilized the accreditation process in an active way, as suggested by O'Neill and Heaney (1982:57-60). The intent behind these modifications was to facilitate change within the organizational climate of the twenty-nine year institution to expand its scope as a place of teaching and learning for personnel as well as clientele.

Various members of the Staff Development Council encouraged and facilitated the changes to the mission statement, philosophy, and objectives at both colleges. Simultaneous to that development, the Council was preparing and distributing the staff development needs assessment of personnel. It planned to use the findings as the foundation for development of its Human Resource Plan for

determining future emphasis of activities and allocation of the funds. The purpose of the major applied research project has been (1) to develop, implement, and analyze the findings of the Staff Development Needs Assessment of the district's human resources and (2) to develop a model for 1990-91 support of staff development activities that reinforce the mission statement, philosophy, and objectives of Chabot College and Las Positas College.

Major Issues and Research Questions

Major issues involve the preparation and the continued vitality of faculty, administration, and classified staff. The research questions deal with means of addressing the concerns and related problems.

The research questions involve

1. What information and skills through various activities are needed (and wanted) by faculty and staff to update/upgrade dissemination of information and interfacing of communications in order to meet the missions of the colleges among the multicultural segments?

2. What incentives are needed (and wanted) by faculty and staff to update/upgrade dissemination of information and interfacing of communications in order to meet the missions of the colleges among the multicultural segments?

3. What type of organizational operating climate does the faculty and staff perceive in relationship to support of staff development?

Definition of Terms

Administrator includes line and staff managers who may be either certificated or classified personnel.

CEO refers to an organization's Chief Executive Officer, who may be the Chancellor or President.

Culture, as viewed by Kuh and Whitt (1988:95), is "holistic, context-bound, and subjective set of attitudes, values, assumptions, and beliefs [within an institution]."

Faculty Development has gained various definitions through time. As defined by Miller, R., (1979:78), it is

> an organized institutional effort to increase professional competence . . . (through) better courses, professional improvement (or updating), higher-quality instruction, and personal development.

Mayhew (1979:234) defined faculty development as the specific activities that helped faculty members

> (1) improve the attractiveness of their courses to improve retention, (2) create proposals that attract external financial support, (3) develop genuine interest in significant institutional problems and a desire and willingness to help solve them, or (4) improve talents and abilities needed to render professional service to the end that the externally perceived values of the institution are enhanced and enrollment, which emphasizes the knowledge base, and faculty revitalization, which concentrates on behavioral modifications, can bring modifications to the organizational culture.

Alfano, et al. (1990:7) explained that

> the purposes of faculty development are improving teaching, improving faculty scholarship, personal development, curriculum development and institutional development.

In-service education, as researched and summarized by Dziuba-Malick (1988:7-9), refers "to providing [and improving] teaching skills, . . . understanding the uniqueness of the two-year college, . . . and to maintain currency in the changing subject matter."

Organizational Development encompasses an overall impact to the entire organization, compared to individual personnel, to increase effectiveness and morale (Magnesen and Parker, 1988:30).

Staff can be broadly used to encompass all faculty, administrators, and classified staff. Sometimes it is used to refer to personnel other than faculty.

Training Needs Assessment (TNA) is the "systematic study of a problem or innovation, incorporating data and opinions from varied sources, in order to make effective decisions or recommendations about what should happen next (Rossett and Arwad 1987:3).

Limitations of the Study

The study will be limited to assessing the staff development needs of both full-time and part-time employees of the district through the perceptions of the individuals themselves.

Assumptions

It is assumed that each respondent to the questionnaire responded with professional introspection.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature has five sections. The first section connects staff development to institutional mission and goals. The second section focuses on the types of staff development needs assessments which were available and the development of a survey instrument. The third section on perspectives of faculty and staff development covers preparation and continued vitality for faculty, administrators, and classified staff. The next section reviews rewards and attitudes interacting with staff development. The last section investigates different options for staff development programs.

The literature on faculty and staff development is extensive. Daresh and McComas (1984) prepared an Expanded Bibliography on Staff Development and Inservice Education between 1977-1983 that included 900 citations from books, journals, and dissertations. Most of these citations were specific to other countries, K-12, and/or focused on very specialized areas, such as addressing needs of the handicapped or poor readers. Donegan (1987) prepared an annotated bibliography of major works on faculty development in community colleges. Her document contained forty-eight citations from ERIC documents and journal articles between 1979-86. Menges and Mathis (1988:254-340) provided

an annotated bibliography of 166 books and articles dealing with various aspects of faculty and staff development, including faculty renewal, career development, development as teachers, development as individuals, and organizational development. Many of these resources focus on four-year institutions. The quantity of literature on faculty/staff development in education demonstrates the strong interest in it for the K-12 and postsecondary systems around the world.

Relating Staff Development to Mission and Goals

Staff development activities and programs need to be related to the mission and goals of the institution in order to bridge the commitment of personnel to that of the institution. Christensen's (1975:30-31) review of the literature, relating staff development to institutional mission and goals, concluded that individual goals should be linked to the organization's goals and objectives. But, Belker's (1983) study of California four-year institutions and community colleges found that faculty development programs were not oriented to institutional goals and objectives. The communication of mission and goals to all employees is essential so that they will be the "driving force in the organization" (Evans, 1984:65).

The call for interfacing staff development with institutional mission and goals has increased during the 1980s. Hall and Petrie (1987:3) suggested that faculty

development be tied to the mission and goals of the institution in order to increase commitment among personnel toward those missions, as well as to the staff development program (Elsner, 1981). Stout (1988) reported that research on continuing education of teachers showed that high quality staff development programs were based on specific goals congruent with the missions of the institution. Belker (1983), Hammons (1982) and McDade (1987:83) emphasized the need to tie staff development to organizational goals for the purpose of institutionalizing an on-going, continuous staff development program. Cappa (1984) and Pierce and Bragg (1984:76) added that part-time, as well as full-time faculty, need to understand the institution's mission and goals.

Understanding the mission, philosophy, goals, and objectives of an employing institution provides the foundation for what transpires at a college. Burton Clark's (1961) study of three colleges showed that personnel develop a "definition" of the institution to which they relate in performing their jobs. In contrast, Apps (1988:8) stated that "most faculty and administrators make assumptions about the aims of the institution." Townsend (1984:5) suggested that the colleges often overlook the faculty support and identification with the "missions or identities" of the college. Medsker (1966); Garrison (1967); Kastner (1973); Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1975); Cain (1982); and Martorana (1989) agreed

that faculty need to understand the intents, purposes, and goals of the institution.

The importance of conveying the mission and goals of community colleges in general and the hiring institution in particular provides the connection between the system and the individual. Gleazer (1973:516) emphasized that

> The faculty of the community college in the future, by their very perceptions of what the college should do and be, will have a great deal to do with what that college becomes.

Each person--whether administrator, faculty, or classified staff--is important. Solomon (1987:7) added to that concept when she stated that

> Organizational effectiveness, then, is dependent on behaviors of each person within the organization as well as one pursuing realistic objectives and missions.

Most presidents and administrators that provide organizational leadership seem to overlook and/or not understand the importance of orienting new faculty and staff into the purposes of the institution.

Colleges should integrate development of their personnel into its strategies. Corbally and Holmberg-Wright (1981:386) stated that "Because a university or college is an institution devoted to learning and to human development, staff development is a legitimate institutional purpose." Weisner (1979) and Martin (1982:38) recommended that faculty development programs be part of the context of institutional development. Hall and

Associates (1987:5) stated that

> Probably the most important single development in theory, research and practice related to careers in recent years has been the attention devoted to strategic human resource planning, the process of linking the organization's strategy for managing human resources to its basic business goals and objectives.

As part of this process, Hall and Associates (1987:9) emphasized that organizations should "encourage employees to be proactive in assessing what they want most (values, needs, interests) and in planning ways to achieve those desires." Strother (1983:1-4) and Mirabile (1986:38-40) supported the participatory decision making in the conception, development, implementation, and evaluation of staff development activities. Caplette (1988:52) explained that a systematic needs assessment can assist in prioritizing organizational and management needs.

There should be a purpose behind faculty/staff development. Craig (1984:31) suggested that the results of providing human resource development "should be assessed in terms of need--improving workforce competence." In this regard, Byrd (1985:7) explained that the scope of faculty development expanded in the 1970s:

> Not only were instructional needs being addressed, but also personal, professional, and organizational needs. Instructional development focused on the curriculum, personal development concentrated on individual growth, professional development sought to improve instructional competencies, and organizational development promoted an effective work environment.

Even so, Kanter (1984) found that staff development

programs in five community colleges were not comprehensive, rather a conglomerate of activities.

Staff development activities should not happen haphazardly within an institution. They need to be oriented toward the missions, goals, and planning of the institution in order to foster and maintain commitment of all employees. In order to develop a strategic human resource plan, the faculty and staff should have the opportunity to express their perceptions of developmental needs. The analysis of the summary data needs to be integrated with the mission and goals of the institution. They need to be based upon needs assessments and correlated with organizational goals.

Types of Needs Assessment or Analysis Instruments

Three main approaches have been used to make needs assessments or analysis of an organization's employees: front-end analysis, task analysis, and attitude surveys. Harless' (1970 and 1988:63-72) front-end analysis directed organizational research into performance analysis to identify deficiencies and to prescribe cost-effective solutions. The Associated Society for Training and Development (McLagan and Bedrich, 1983:4-1) recommended a task analysis approach that included "identifying activities, tasks, sub-tasks, human resources, and support requirements necessary to accomplish specific results in a job or an organization." The use of attitude surveys to

collect informational feedback within an organization have been used since Lewin developed the process in the 1940s (Werther, Ruch, and McClure, 1986:243). Its continued usage is supported by Dyer (1984) and Elizur (1984). Daley (1984) supplemented the concept of attitude surveys with an investigation of gender-based perceptional differences.

Attitude surveys have been the primary means of needs assessment in postsecondary education. Caetano (1978:1-6) developed a model to improve faculty attitudes toward their work; usage of a need assessment was the second step of his model. Vogler (1980) delineated a feasibility instrument based upon perceptions as the starting point for inservice education. Bergquist and Phillips (1977:31-41) developed an eight-page questionnaire for faculty to express their perceptions of their needs and interests related to staff development. The above authors (1975:203-204) also provided background and two survey instruments for determining faculty attitudes and values through interviews. Byrd, 1985; Harnish and Creamer, 1985-86; Chickering, Gamson, and Barsi, 1987; Caldwell, 1988; Peralta District, 1989; Scull, 1988a; Santa Rosa Junior College, 1989; Sacramento City College, 1989; Rancho Santiago Community College, 1989 also have used perception surveys to investigate needs, concerns, and interests of faculty and staff within colleges. Imperial Valley College's (1989) eight-page attitude survey had six pages of

Likert-type questions and two pages of open-ended questions, such as recommended by Kintzer (1977).

Needs Assessment Instruments. A hand ERIC search at California State University, Hayward and a review of Dissertations Abstracts provided some examples of proactive needs assessment instruments that had been used to survey various personnel in a college. The available forms of assessment instruments were of two basic types: (1) perceptional questionnaires on job satisfaction and staff development needs that were approached from an emotional response perspective and (2) reportive and evaluative questionnaires of existing staff development activities.

A number of assessment studies were oriented toward perceptions of job satisfaction by faculty in the post-secondary education arena. They included studies of university business faculty (Ridnour, 1985), university speech/communications faculty (Washington, 1975), role perceptions of two-year faculty (Solomon, 1987), and satisfaction of office workers (Beardsley, 1983). These studies helped sensitize the Council in developing the section on organizational climate.

Other assessment studies were oriented toward perceived staff development needs of full-time faculty. Bergquist and Phillips (1977:32-41) designed a Professional Development Questionnaire with the following nine parts: (1) Professional Objectives, (2) Ability to Pursue

Professional Goals, (3) Interaction with Students, (4) Teaching Role, (5) Time Expenditure, (6) Rewards, (7) Institutional Innovation, (8) Professional Development Interests, and (9) Background and General Information. It was used as a national model in the 1970s.

Instruments of smaller studies were found. Christensen (1975) surveyed administrators and faculty at three suburban community colleges that were less than ten years old to determine differences between their views of faculty development needs. He modified the faculty development inventory instrument that had been developed by Dr. Max Raines of Michigan State University in 1973. The longer, modified three-page instrument had the following parts: Development Need--questions 1 - 22; Professional Climate, questions 23 - 46; Incentives, questions 47 - 62; Values, questions 63 - 81.

Fitzgerald (1980) used the Raines two-page survey instrument, that had been validated and found reliable by Christensen (1975) for his Florida Keys Community College study. The Raines Professional Development Needs Survey instrument focused on the staff development relevance of twenty-two items related to the context of community college instruction as perceived by the respondents. The faculty respondents rated the importance of each activity for general faculty need, but not to their own particular interest in participating in the activity. The intent of

this study was to determine interest of each respondent in participating in an activity.

Two other studies had been made in the southeast. Caldwell (1988) studied staff development needs of South Carolina's two-year technical colleges by surveying full-time faculty and department heads. The assessment instrument contained sixty-five items on the following seven topics: (1) Program Planning, Development, and Evaluation, (2) Instructional Planning, (3) Instructional Execution, (4) Instructional Evaluation, (5) Instructional Management, (6) Guidance, and (7) Professional Role and Development. Another short questionnaire to faculty was the one-page Special Interest Survey that was sent to the full-time faculty of Southeast Missouri State University (Eison, 1986).

Several studies also had been made on perceptions of part-time faculty training needs. Williams (1985) investigated professional development practices of part-time instructors at selected community colleges that participate in the League for Innovation. Turner and Phillips (1981) and Byrd (1985) studied staff development needs of part-time faculty, as perceived by the part-time faculty and staff development officers in Florida community colleges. Elioff (1980), Spinetta (1988), and Kelly (1990a) studied development needs and participation of part-timers within California community colleges. Additional studies were done in other states by such

writers as Grymes, 1976; Schultz and Roed, 1978; Hoffman and Pool, 1979; and McCright, 1983.

Other types of studies used reportive or evaluative survey instruments. Commissioned by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). Berman, Itili, and Weiler (1988a and 1988b) prepared and distributed a questionnaire to collect quantitative information on faculty in the University of California, California State University, and community college systems. It had four objectives: "(1) how much professional development occurs for faculty, (2) what it costs, (3) what kinds of development activities take place, and (4) what the development needs are" (Berman and Weiler, 1988:1). These reports were the research that provided the data for incorporating staff development into the AB 1725 legislation.

Prior to the California study, at least two national associations had done studies on staff development. In 1985-86, the American Council on Education sponsored a study (Petrovich and Hexter, 1986) on "Campus Approaches to Faculty Retraining." This study provided descriptions of the background, program, funding, and outcomes for faculty retraining of four statewide systems, seven public four-year institutions, four independent four-year institutions, and two public two-year community colleges. In 1987, Hall and Petrie (1987) surveyed the professional development practices of eighteen colleges which had joined a 1968 consortium called the League for Innovation in the

Community College. Their survey concentrated on what faculty development practices were available within the colleges. They offered four recommendations to the League for Innovation to promote the sharing of innovations as a League-wide priority.

Local needs assessment of personnel should include both micro assessment for the individual and macro assessments for the needs of groups (Rostek and Kladivko, 1988). The "Inventories of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" by Chickering, Gamson, and Barsi (1987) was reviewed by the Staff Development Council with these concepts in mind. The Institutional Inventory had six sections: (1) Climate, (2) Academic Practices, (3) Curriculum, (4) Faculty, (5) Academic and Student Support Services, and (6) Facilities. Each statement had four options for choice; the responses are marked in a booklet. The format used boxes in columns.

Published information, as well as unpublished information, should be investigated when searching for survey examples (Clover and Balsley, 1984:53-73). Contacts with other community college Staff Development Coordinators through the California Community College Council for Staff Development provided four recent needs assessments examples. Glendale Community College surveyed its faculty in 1988, established a formalized professional development program, and made its report (Scull, 1988b) available statewide. Glendale's five-page needs assessment

(Scull, 1988a) was distributed to administrators, classified staff, and faculty. The instrument investigated attitudes and values of the staff regarding potential activities in implementing the nine areas of AB 1725. The format involved multiple choice options, which were to be selected and recorded on a Scantron sheet. Santa Rosa Junior College (1989) used the nine AB 1725 parameters for the central organization of its open-ended needs assessment of each instructional division. The needs assessment instrument, developed by Sacramento City College in 1989, concentrated on the developmental climate within the institution; the last page focused on rating potential developmental activities. Rancho Santiago Community College's 1989-90 needs assessment had nine pages. The instrument included multiple choice options, short answer questions, and a three-column layout for checking one of the three following options: "would attend," "might attend," or "would not attend."

The instruments of most of the state and national studies required responses to existing staff development practices for faculty. They were inappropriate to use as the instrument for this study, which encompassed full-time and part-time faculty, administration, and classified staff. The instruments of the 1970s were more formalistic than needed for an investigation of one institution's needs. The instruments used to collect perceptional data provided insights into design, content, and response

levels. None of the documents entirely provided either the focus or the breadth to guide the research needed for the data collection of this study. As a result, it was determined that a training needs assessment instrument had to be developed, utilizing organization, wording, and formatting options from the numerous instruments found in the literature.

Development of a Survey Instrument

Various factors need to be taken into consideration in the development of a questionnaire. Babbie (1973:131-185), Missouri University (1981), Sudman and Bradburn (1983: 207-260), Clover and Balsley (1984: 157-171), and Zemke and Kramlinger (1988:155-169) provided various approaches to the conceptualization of designing a survey instrument. Some of these considerations included (1) the construction and format of the document, (2) units of analysis, (3) the design of the questions, (4) question sequencing, and (5) question wording. Rummel and Ballaine (1963:124), Babbie (1973:155), Dillman, et al. (1974:746), and Berdie and Anderson (1974:34-36) described various approaches to the conceptualization of designing a survey instrument. Some of these considerations included (1) the construction and form of the document, (2) units of analysis, (3) the design of the questions, (4) question sequencing, and (5) question wording. Rummel and Ballaine (1963:124), Babbie (1973:155), Dillman, et al., (1974:746), Berdie and

Anderson (1974:34-36), and Clough (1988) explained various options for visual presentation and production of the survey document. These concepts provide the framework and part to the development of a survey instrument.

Internally developed, organization-specific survey instruments can uncover vital information about an organization's human resource programs and ways to change organizational environments (Sahl, 1990:46). In developing a customized survey instrument, R. Anderson (1980) and Kidder (1981:159-160) suggested that questionnaire writers "borrow" questions from instruments that have been used. The selection and development of questions for the assessment must form into a design that meets the unique needs of the situation (Klevans, 1987:16). Various questions from the different questionnaires, which were reviewed, have been borrowed in the formulation of the South County Community College District's Staff Development Needs Assessment Questionnaire.

Most of the survey instruments used for national, state, district, or college investigations were more than five pages in length. Champion and Sear (1969:336) referred to Goode and Hart and to Selltiz when indicating that shorter surveys were more often returned. Christensen's (1975) three-page instrument had a return rate of sixty-one percent from faculty and sixty-nine percent from administration. Eison's (1986) one-page

Special Interest Survey had a return rate of forty-six percent. Sletto (1940:195), Champion and Sear (1969:227-339), Dillman, et al. (1974:755), and Heberlein and Baumgartner (1978:51) gave data showing that good returns could be gotten from long questionnaires of several pages. The key factor in getting good returns was the saliency or relevancy of the questionnaire's topic to the respondent (Heberlein and Baumgartner, 1978:50). Rummel and Ballaine (1963:124) stated that

> the length of the questionnaire should be dependent entirely upon the extensiveness of the data required and should not be controlled by the expected number of returns.

Saliency of the instrument to the respondent influences the return rates more than length.

The design of a questionnaire has to interface many considerations, including the context of the text, the layout of the text, the size and boldness of the print, and the length of the document. In addition, the conceptualization of the instrument has to address the alternative means of soliciting answers through multiple choice options, the sequencing of questions, and question wording. The design and content of questionnaires may be improved by borrowing from other instruments which have been used.

Perspectives on Faculty and Staff Development

The nature of the activities within an organization are dependent not only on the people within the

organization but also on the way things are done within it. The spirit, or lack thereof, of personnel can be a function of the culture. This section of the review of literature includes three parts: (1) Organizational Climate, (2) Faculty, Administrator, Classified Staff Preparation and Continued Vitality, and (3) Rewards and Attitudes Interacting with Staff Development.

Organizational Climate

The attitudes, behavior, and job satisfaction of personnel are influenced by the organizational climate. The resulting actions of individual employees within the organization determine the degrees of success or effectiveness of the organization as a whole.

The tone of an institution and its organizational culture are historically developed and maintained from the highest management levels within an institution (Corbally and Holmberg-Wright, 1981:388; Beck and Hillmar, 1986:24). Administrators establish the work situations (Garrison, 1967:24) and a tone that often stifles creativity and blunts enthusiasm (Frymier, 1987). Heger (1982:18) contended that the contexts of organizations in postsecondary education have not changed:

> After decades of talk, mandates, and incentives to change, education today is structured much as it was in 1950 or even 1935. Schools and universities . . . have grown in size but have not changed their organizational procedures--their ways of doing business and allocating human resources.

Heger (1982:18) explained that historically, change has been initiated from top management in the forms of "monetary incentives, political pressure, legal pressure, or some combination thereof." What changes that did occur were initiated most often through a long-term CEO president in paternalistic ways (Chandler and Julius, 1979:30) that fostered the sense of organizational family. Richardson, Blocker, and Bender (1972:84) and Zoglin (1976:111) stated that the bureaucratic organizational structures used in higher education insure the control of the few administrators at the top of the pyramid. In such a structure, the rest of the employees occupy lower segments with lower participation.

The California legislature included the concept of "shared governance" in AB 1725. As a result, existing and new presidents require skills in establishing a more participative and coalition-building environment (Baker, Roueche, and Rose, 1988:36) and a sense of organizational community (Hall, 1988:119-125). They need to re-evaluate their roles as an institutional administrator and as an educational leader (Cohen and Roueche, 1969). Presidents need to set the tone of the environment of the organization from the top downward through the hierarchy and into the offices, classrooms and other worksites.

Lack of leadership, skills, and supportive management procedures filter, therefore, from the top into the classrooms and offices. Eble (1983:172) recounted that our

society has produced "several generations of inanimate management" by promoting people with technical expertise but no training in management of the social technology of management. Beck and Hillmar (1986:34) submitted that managers, focused on efficiency, are concerned on internal activities and rates of production; whereas, managers, focused on effectiveness, concentrate on what their sub-groups should be doing to satisfy needs and/or demands of the clientele. Bess (1984:129) referred to Vroom who claimed that "there is a paucity of research on leadership in higher education." Development of leadership and administrative skills from the top of the organization downward is needed for individual and institutional effectiveness.

The method of funding California community colleges has had its impact on organizational focus and bureaucratization. On the whole, administrators have focused on quantitative measures because funding was based on Average Daily Attendance (ADA). As a result, the functions of the community colleges have become based on numbers of enrollments. Lorenzo (1990) pointed out that the success of the community colleges has historically been measured through increases in enrollments (ADA), rather than outcomes (Wilms and Moore, 1987:8). Consequently, administrators have become enchanted with increasing numbers of students, buildings, and colleges (Titlow, 1980:1). Richardson (1988:28-29) verified the point that

community colleges have

> . . . pursued increases in enrollment both as a means of enhancing their visibility and importance within the educational world and as a means of increasing revenues, since their funding was closely tied to enrollments.

Bradshaw (1985:67-74) condemned the presence and domination within postsecondary education thinking that "financial exigency can justify and legitimate every decision" within the academic community. Immediate dollars have been more important than long-term sense.

The rapid changes in the workings of the economy and the composition of society requires an adjustment to the institutional mindset. According to Lynton (1983:19), administrators and faculty in postsecondary education have remained focused on preparatory education and allocating lesser attention and status on continuing education. Postsecondary institutions need to start placing greater emphasis on "preventing human capital obsolescence by trying to anticipate changes in job content . . . and to realize that occupational and professional development is a lifelong process" for their clientele as well as personnel. Bradford and Cohen (1984) described how managing for excellence requires personnel development as a continuous process. Cervero (1988:2) alerted educators to the need for lifelong professional education, such as embraced by accountants, lawyers and doctors. O'Banion (1976:25) warned that

> community college leaders must begin to pay as much attention to their staff as to students, programs, buildings and organizational structure. The priority of the future is a priority on persons, on the needs of the people who staff the people's college.

Pedras (1985b:1) submitted that the needs of students will not be met unless the faculty are supported by professional development programs. The mindset must be changed. All community college employees have to be lifelong learners (Stern, 1989) in order to address needs of students.

In particular, the quality of education is based on the quality of the faculty (O'Banion, 1977; Hammons, Wallace, and Watts, 1978; Gaff, 1979; Vaughan, 1982a, 1986; Keller, 1983:22). Harris and Grede (1977:258) explained that community colleges "need excellent teaching faculty; no learning system is effective without faculty effectiveness." On this basis, Doerr (1986:53) pointed to the faculty as "the heart of the university [college]." The findings of the California Association of Community College study (Renkiewicz, 1988) connected faculty effectiveness to community college success. Valek (1986:93) reflected that the staff of a college is its most significant and largest capital investment.

Community colleges have not valued their personnel highly, even though "the lifetime cost of each tenured faculty member exceeds one million dollars" (Bush and Ames, 1984:22). David Snyder (1984:3) emphasized the point that "Human resources are a nation's principal economic asset."

Lynton (1983:18) proclaimed that there is "little sense in making the investment [in personnel] if there is no willingness to devote the resources necessary for its upkeep and renovation." He (1983:19) maintained that

> employers must incorporate human resources as a critical component in their long-term strategic planning and accept the need for systematic, ongoing maintenance of this resource as an essential protection of investment.

Boards, as well as their CEOs and presidents, of two-year colleges need to recognize that personnel are their principal economic assets.

The 1975 Bergquist and Phillips model included the area of Organization Development, referred to in business and industry as OD, as one of its three staff development areas. Cooper's (1981) investigation of staff development programs at five midwest community colleges found that none of the colleges' programs included organizational development components. Jay Hall's (1988:205-206) study of personnel in nine organizations of different types but including an elementary school system found a positive relationship between conditions of competence, support processes, and performance results.

The organizational climate both controls and allows the sense of purpose and directions for the personnel of the institution. It emanates values that are reflected in decision making and implementation of policies and procedures (Peters and Waterman, 1982; Naisbitt, 1982; Deal

and Kennedy, 1982; Morrisey, 1983:96-98; and Hall, 1988:77-79). Each institution has a particular history, unique set of values, range of resources, and developed culture (Cervero, 1988:76), wherein individual and organizational vitality are interrelated (Clark, Boyer, and Corcoran, 1985:22). To that point, Baker (1988:14) recommended that the organizational climate be positive and that

> leaders should be aware of how to behave and cause others to behave in such a way that individuals are motivated and dedicated to the mission of the college.

Martorana (1989) explained that there is a relationship between effective leadership producing organizational enhancement and the building of a culture congruent with and supportive of the institution's purpose and mission.

Although substantial literature is available on the worklife in the private sector, not much has been written about worklife in colleges and universities (Austin and Gamson, 1983:72). In the 1980s, writers, such as Jacobson (1984) and Eble and McKeachie (1985), began studying faculty attitudes and instructional vitality. A mid-1980 study done for the Council of Independent Colleges on ten liberal arts colleges found that commitment to the institution's missions, institutional policies, and a sense of "colleagueship" promoted faculty morale and satisfaction. These attitudes expressed themselves throughout the organization by influencing not only personnel

attitudes but also the interactions with students. Martin (1982:36) pointed out that

> The climate of an institution is as essential to vitality as the subject matter taught therein. That climate will influence what is taught as well as how it is taught, what is learned as well as how it is applied by the learner.

Newton (1987:3), referring to a 1986 study done by the University of Washington and the Seattle Public School District, reported that a major finding was the inter-relationship of the workplace's quality or climate to the development and teaching effectiveness of beginning and experienced teachers. Interfacing that finding from a K-12 system into the postsecondary system, McKeachie (1986:5) concluded that what happens in a course is connected to the college culture. The tone and values filter from the top, through the organization and into the offices and classroom.

The late 1980s have brought a change in attitudes from the 1970s; these changes in attitudes affect the organizational climate. Armes and O'Banion (1983:87) indicated that although staff development activities "have typically been envisioned as embracing all personnel . . . most programs have considered the primary recipients to be faculty." Other writers, such as Vaughan (1982b) and Orlich (1989:84), have broadened the scope of recipients of development activities beyond the faculty. Hall and Petrie (1987:3) supported this extension because

> ultimately, the purpose of any faculty development program is to enable faculty to serve better the students they teach. A philosophy of faculty development, therefore, needs to reflect an institutional commitment to fostering an environment where administrators, faculty, staff, and students can grow and learn from each other. When the notion of a community of learners is encouraged, faculty development becomes far more than comprehensive sabbaticals, workshops and conference travel.

If the organization's climate is not supportive of the development of its personnel, positive change probably will not occur (Kanter, 1979:3-9; Wood, 1981:63; Loucks-Horsley, et al., 1987:7-9; Forman, 1989:18).

The California legislature through AB 1725 has provided the external impetus and incentives for changing the organizational climates of the community colleges through its extension of responsibilities to faculty and classified staff. These responsibilities include such aspects as staff development assessment, planning, implementing, and evaluating. Prior to this time, such tasks have been the exclusive right of administrative decision making. A change to the administrative mindset regarding human resource development was externally legislated by AB 1725. The legislature also funded professional/technical updating and growth of community college personnel so it would occur despite the management styles of the CEO, the traditional organizational climate of the institution, or the system of financing the two-year colleges.

Faculty, Administrator, Classified Staff Preparation and Continued Vitality

Performance and productivity of educational personnel, particularly faculty, has been a concern of writers and legislators. Business and industry spend billions of dollars in training each year to improve performance and productivity. Education has not placed a high priority in training/educating its employees.

New Faculty Preparation and Training. Like the universities, new faculty hired in community colleges must have expertise in a discipline and do not need to have taken any course work in teaching/learning methodologies or classroom experience. Cohen (1970:CEN3A), Cohen and Brawer (1968:10, 1982:66-67, 76; 1987:68), and Case (1985:84) explained that traditionally community college faculty qualifications have been a master's degree in a discipline or equivalent experience in an occupation area. Christensen (1975:16) presented a table based on the studies of Koos in 1941-42, Medsker in 1960, Wattenbarger in 1963, and Medsker-Tillery in 1970; it showed the percentage of faculty with master degrees increasing from 64 percent in the 1940s to 78 percent in 1970.

Since the community college system evolved from the K-12 system, basic qualifications for faculty were established through the education code, which required credentialing through the state. In general, the credentialing code has required a masters degree for

academic areas and lesser degrees combined with business and industry work experience. Gaff (1983:71) complained that faculty are "not broadly educated," resulting in the fostering of specialization protectionism. The credential has not required a comprehensive education.

New faculty with training in teaching and learning methodologies have not been a hiring priority in recent years. But, as Morrison (1985:75) explained, faculty who have not come through the secondary school system "seldom have training in instruction, curricula design, or adult education." Few new faculty, who have not taught in K-12 systems, have taken any courses to prepare them for working and teaching in a community college (Thornton, 1966; Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

In the past, community colleges depended upon secondary schools to provide the classroom experience for their new faculty. Cohen and Brawer (1982:76) reported that until the 1960s most instructors entering the community college system had teaching experience in the secondary schools. They referred to (1) Eells' study in the 1920s that showed 80 percent of the two-year college faculty had high school teaching experience, (2) Medsker's study in the 1950s that showed sixty-four percent of the two-year faculty had either high school or elementary school experience, and (3) the California State Department of Education's 1963-64 study indicating that forty-four percent of new academic teachers for community colleges

came from secondary schools. Medsker and Tillery (1971) reported on Phair's 1968-69 California study which found that thirty-six percent of new community college faculty came from secondary schools; fifteen percent from four-year institutions, nineteen percent from a different community college, nine percent from graduate schools, and eleven percent from industry and business.

Cohen and Brawer (1982:76) concluded that the trend of hiring from the secondary schools had changed by the 1970s; higher percentages of new faculty came from graduate programs, from other community colleges, and from the trades. Blackburn, O'Connell, and Pellino (1981) agreed with that trend: high school faculty were no longer being recruited and the new faculty were basically coming from universities, usually with master degrees and some with doctorates.

Blackburn, O'Connell, and Pellino (1981:463) noted that these new faculty wanted "to publish, to do creative work that leads to visible products, to attend professional meetings, and to have professional (disciplinary) contacts." Bess (1984:19-22) characterized the change as "miscast professionals." He explained that most new college teachers are self-selecting, recruited by faculty, and/or applicants into graduate school on the basis of capabilities of research interests. Nine years earlier Riday, Bingham, and Harvey (1984-85:46) performed a job satisfaction study among secondary faculty, community

college faculty, and four-year faculty; they found that community college faculty were more satisfied in seven out of ten measurements than faculty of the other levels. The article, however, did not report the percentages of community college faculty who had entered from one of the other two levels.

The classroom environments also have been affected by these new teachers without training in teaching. Graduate programs seldom include preparation for teaching roles (Gaff, Jerry G., 1978:45 and Heermann, Enders, and Wine, 1980). New teachers coming directly from universities without learning theory or classroom methodology survive by imitating the faculty from whom they took classes (Gamson and Associates, 1984:105-106; Starling, 1987:4). In this way, certain approaches become self-perpetuating, particularly the trial and error success or fail method.

L. Dee Fink (1982) studied one hundred beginning college (university) teachers who were making the transition from a graduate student to a full-time faculty member. Her review of the literature reflected a paucity in primary research on the needs and concerns of new, inexperienced college teachers and a 1960-1970 emphasis in the literature on teaching assistantships. Griffin (1985) concurred, indicating that the literature on induction of teachers in the K-12 system was basically subjective in nature supplemented with few studies with hard data. Since 1985, new interest and studies have surfaced on the

necessity and worth of induction programs (Varah, 1985; Huling-Austin and Murphy, 1987:1-3; and Huling-Austin, 1989:13-16).

Training of new faculty into methodologies of teaching and learning has somehow seemed unprofessional in education. There has been an expectation that faculty newcomers are professionals. Varah, Theune, and Parker (1989) referred to Bush's statement at a 1983 international conference where he claimed that new faculty have been left to learn to swim very quickly or to sink under a survival mentality. In place of training, administrators have economized on time through new faculty orientations. The orientation process typically introduces new faculty to the physical plant, the administrators, enrollment/attendance procedures, and payroll factors. Such orientation is standardly more extensive for full-time faculty than it is for part-time faculty.

Astin and Lee (1970:AS&LE-1A-12A) reported on a 1966 study done through the American Council on Education by surveying 1,100 deans in junior colleges and four-year colleges and universities. Its findings show that ninety percent of the junior colleges provided orientation to new faculty before classes, forty-nine percent provided "seminars" for them by the institution (usually through selective administrators), twenty-nine percent provided training through the department, and two percent had summer institutes or related intensive programs for new faculty.

institutes or related intensive programs for new faculty. Los Medanos College in California requires a four-week, pre-service seminar prior to the start of instruction and provides reduced loads for participation in the year-long in-service program (Case, 1976). Although the statistics were higher for the junior colleges than for the four-year institutions, they concluded that more training needs to be done on teaching methodologies and classroom learning.

The issue of better training for teachers across the spectrum of education remains a concern. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1986a) described the evolution of beginning teacher induction over the past twenty years. Some writers (Anrig, 1986; Wallace, 1986; Woodring, 1987) lamented the shortcomings of teachers of elementary and secondary schools who had gone through education programs in the universities in recent years. They recommended changes to improve the background experiences for teachers. Various state legislatures, such as California (California State Department of Education, 1983), Oklahoma (Elsner, 1984), Nevada, New Mexico, and Pennsylvania (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985), mandated induction programs for new faculty in order to improve classroom teaching and learning in their K-12 systems. Veenman's (1984) survey of the literature concentrated on problems of new faculty. Garrison (1967:47-48) and Pascale (1986:222) explained the importance of training new hirees into the organizational culture in order to minimize frustration,

Just as new employees need to be oriented and trained in private-sector organizations, new faculty, hired from varying sources, need orientation and training. Whatever the past experience, they will not be fully-qualified to teach effectively the unique student population of the employing institution (Merson, 1971:10). Roueche and Herrscher (1970:CEN3A) maintained that

> criteria for the "effective teacher" has never been stabilized. . . . There is no one "right way" to prepare teachers any more than there is one "right way" to teach.

But, the lack of training and of institutional support for newly hired faculty increases stress levels that in turn get passed into the classroom environment.

Part-time Faculty. The total faculty of the two-year colleges have always included part-time teachers. Cohen and Brawer (1982:70) stated that until the 1970s, most part-time instructors came from either the high schools or four-year institutions. Their statistics show that the percentage of part-time to full-time faculty decreased from forty-eight percent in 1953 to thirty-four percent in 1968. This decrease in percentages, along with the prior or simultaneous teaching experience, may have been the reasons that Bender and Hammons (1972) observed that no studies were available on the teaching effectiveness of adjunct faculty.

Such studies did not start to be made until 1975, according to Guthrie-Morse (1979), when one-third of the

postsecondary faculty were part-timers (Lightman, Katz, and Helly, 1987:48). The National Center for Education Statistics, reported McDougle (1980:20), showed that the number of part-time faculty increased eighty percent from 1975-1979, to fifty-six percent by 1980 (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). By the mid-1980s, forty-one percent of all postsecondary faculty across the country were part-time (Bradshaw, 1985:71). The 1987 Study of Part-time Instruction (Office of the Chancellor, 1987) showed that fifty to sixty percent of California community colleges' faculty are part-time. That percentage correlated with the use of fifty-four percent part-time faculty by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1986a, 1986b). To a large extent, part-time faculty have been hired for their professional competence, not for their pedagogical training (Pedras, 1985b:2).

The 1970s started the trend of increased enrollments due to the addition of non-traditional students. Spinetta (1988:5-8) delineated the statistical information to point out California's particularly high usage of adjunct faculty and the national realignment of proportionately increasing part-time to full-time faculty since the 1970s. She stated that the numbers of part-time faculty increased as colleges moved more and more into community services, attracting more part-time students during the 1970s. Both part-time students and part-time faculty have remained and increased

within the context of the two-year colleges (Vaughan (1984:28).

Many writers of the late 1970s and 1980s have expressed concern over the proportionately increasing usage of part-time faculty in higher education (Sewell, Brydon, and Prosser, 1976; Haddad and Dickens, 1978; Parsons, 1980; McDougle, 1980; Cottingham, Neuman, and Sims, 1981; Hammons and Watts, 1983). Some of the concerns with the increased use of part-time faculty is associated with two factors: (1) more relaxed recruiting and hiring procedures than those used for full-time faculty and (2) limited teaching expertise (Maher and Ebben, 1978 and Williams, 1985). These two factors suggest a problem of lowered quality of instruction. Yet, the study done by Cruise, Furst, and Klimes (1980) concluded that there is no statistical difference between the effectiveness of full-time and part-time faculty.

The primary source for new faculty in community colleges has shifted from the secondary schools to a new cadre of part-time instructors. Lightman, Katz, and Helly (1987) reported on the Tuckman's 1976 national study that addressed the constituencies of part-time faculty who were divided into seven groups; seventeen percent were hopeful full-timers. Kelly (1990a) found in her 1988 study of part-time faculty that twenty percent of the 375 part-time faculty at Fullerton College in California were high school teachers. Hauff and Berdie (1989) found that one-third of

the part-time faculty in Minnesota were in their first-year of community college teaching. California community colleges have come to depend upon part-time faculty as an important source of applicants for faculty jobs. This change has implications for faculty preparedness for teaching and for affirmative action commitments.

Part-time faculty are a neglected constituency in the community college (Bender and Hammons, 1972; Peterson, 1982; and McDougle, 1980:20). But, William's (1985) national study on professional development practices at eleven institutions in the League of Innovation in Community Colleges found that part-time instructors (sixty-one percent of whom had other full-time jobs) were generally satisfied with pre-service orientation and their inservice training. In contrast, Williams reported on Ferrett's 1975 study of new part-time faculty at a Michigan community college that was experiencing an increase in new students with specialized needs. Two of her conclusions were that pre-service orientations and continuing in-service training by community colleges were needed. Other studies, such as Parson's (1978) and Hauff and Berdie's (1989), found that the adjunct faculty wanted continuing education workshops beyond the administrative orientation on forms and procedures.

Training of part-time faculty should not be haphazard. Some type of systematic approach needs to be used to focus and maintain the orientation and continued training for

part-time faculty. Three approaches for part-time staff development were explained by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1986b): (1) The curriculum development model provides a series of workshops or courses that build upon teaching skills and the background of the community colleges. (2) The personnel management approach links new part-time faculty to administrators throughout the hiring and induction processes. (3) The adult education approach allows part-time faculty to identify their own staff development needs through needs assessment surveys; in-service activities are then provided.

Both full-time and part-time faculty have development needs that should include pre-service and in-service training. In the past, most administrators have used the assumption that competence in a discipline or vocational skill provided the competence to teach for student learning. Part-time faculty are a more heterogeneous constituency than full-timers; they not only need teaching/learning strategies and techniques for classroom effectiveness but also information about the purposes of the community college for integration into the community college system. With appropriate orientation and inservice training opportunities, they can be a strong teaching resource for community colleges.

Continued Faculty Vitality. Besides the issues of preparedness in a discipline and classroom methodologies, other factors have come to influence the vitality of

community college teaching. These factors include continual social, economic, and cultural changes that drive needed change within community colleges (Martorana, 1986:4-5). Faculty need to become aware of these changes and adapt to them in relationship to instruction. Case (1985:82-83) explained that

> the essential work of the teacher is the management of the teaching and learning transaction . . . Integral to the work is the selection, preparation, and organization of teaching methods and materials. The teacher must learn about learners and about the consequences of learner characteristics for curriculum and instruction. Formative and summative evaluation of learner outcomes and the teaching process itself is an essential aspect of the work.

Various authors, such as Solomon (1987:2-3) and Swick (1989:11), recounted that multiplicity of roles [tasks], combined with the ambiguity of the various roles, fuels the stress levels of faculty. Certain stresses may help people be more effective and productive (Swick and Hanley, 1987 and Gold, 1988). Job stress and job satisfaction have a multi-dimensional relationship rather than a single-dimensional relationship (Pelsma, 1987).

Faculty, once hired to fill a job description, have been left to perform their hired tasks on a survival basis. A mentality has been assumed that educated persons have been hired for the job; how "educable" (Bradshaw, 1985:70) these people are was not particularly considered. In contrast, Roueche (1990) submitted that once quality faculty are hired, the institution should provide a

comprehensive orientation and continuously invest in ongoing, professional development for new faculty.

With the repetition of tasks year after year, faculty have became "burned out"--i.e., become fatigued due to the environmental pressures which are beyond their control (Eble, 1978:83-84; Cohen and Brawer, 1982:80; Martin, 1982; Atschuler and Richter, 1985; and Forman, 1989:10). Claggett's (1980) study of two-year faculty found that over half of the sources of stress was related to administrative decision-making that affected the individual faculty member. Richman and Farmer (1976:146-147) pointed out that most incompetent or disruptive faculty were once creative people and that no one within the institutions seemed to care whether it was the institution's fault or the individual's fault in the change that occurred (Chell, 1987:50).

Administrators have given little attention to the potential growth of faculty (Richardson, Blocker, and Bender, 1972). Yet, faculty have been accused as being resisters to change (Cohen and Roueche, 1969:27-28; Nordvall, 1982:5-7; Case, 1985:81) even though they are not the only educational professionals who may resist change (Gaff, Jerry G. 1978:44-45).

Vaughan (1983:194) explained March and Simon's 1958 "exchange process" whereby the employee and the organization interact in meeting the needs and in utilizing skills of both factors. He suggested that individuals and

organizations can either benefit from their relationship or that employees can become uncommitted and ineffective when the organization fails to meet their needs.

Surviving within the organizational culture has become more complex with limited opportunities. Faculty lack the mobility of moving within an institution (Wergin, Mason, and Munson, 1976), from one institution to another (Lhota, 1976:1; Goldberg, 1978:57; Schurr, 1980; and Case, 1985:87; Schuster, 1989) or to other careers (Gaff, 1975). Twombly (1986:35-43) referred to the 1958 study of McGee and the 1967 study of Caplow that reported the limited mobility of faculty among institutional types, such as moving from a community college to a university.

The result has been either a compressed career ladder with faculty reaching the highest rung many years before retirement (Light, 1974:263 and Schuster, 1989:64) or a one-stage career (Caldwell, 1986). Veninga and Spradley (1981:202-234) explained that these are the kinds of factors that lead people into believing that they are working in "dead-end jobs," and environments that lock people in create ill will and frustration (Bush and Ames, 1984). Faculty feel "stuck" and immobilized (Kanter, 1979; Schurr, 1980; Snyder, 1988:7; and Schuster, 1986:278, 1989:64) or neutered (Frymier, 1987:9) with little control over their environment (Melendez and de Guzman, 1983:13-17). They have academic burnout (Sparks, 1979; Gold, 1988;

Todd-Mancillas, 1988) that impairs their abilities to effectively teach and perform related services.

According to Shulman (1979:18), faculty have depended upon job mobility to attain job satisfaction. Clark, Boyer, and Corcoran (1985:13) reflected that "reduced mobility is associated with numerous negative responses, including lowered aspirations and self-esteem, disengagement from work, and destructive forms of coping behavior," resulting in depression (Bennett, 1983b:54). Such behavior, Beck and Hillmar (1986:67-68) believed, forms negative energy within the organization, inducing counterproductive behaviors among personnel and fostering poor problem-solving efforts. Harnish and Creamer (1985-86:33) warned that negative attitudes of bored, stagnant and/or uninterested faculty can have undesirable consequences on students, instructional quality, and institutional vitality.

Such faculty attitudes have evolved in spite of on-going professional development practices as sabbaticals and conferences. Cohen and Brawer (1987:72-73) reported on surveys from the Center for the Study of Community Colleges from 1975-1984 regarding professional activities of Humanities faculty. The studies indicated that (1) three-fourths of the faculty periodically attended conferences related to their teaching, (2) one-third had written for publications, and (3) one-fourth had applied for grants. Snyder (1988:14) contended, however, that the traditional

staff development activities of travel and conference cannot "provide the necessary training for faculty forced to teach a more diverse student population." Yet, according to two national studies, administrators perceive travel and grants effective staff development practices (Centra, 1976 and Smith, 1981).

Most community colleges provide a standardized formula for staff development. Chavez's (1973) study of over 700 community colleges showed that in-service staff development programs concentrated on travel and external conferences and workshops. They are low-cost and low-risk activities (Lacey, 1983).

Technology has been changing the workplace and integrating its parts so that all faculty of academic-oriented and career-oriented areas have been affected. During the past ten years the computer has forged its way into firms, households, and educational settings. Armistead, Vogler, and Branch (1987:38-44) reported on educational uses of computers for different curricular purposes. Their study and Watson's (1988) study found that generally faculty from all areas envision some kinds of computer applications in discipline areas and that they needed opportunities to experiment with the equipment and softwares with some staff assistance. Snyder (1988:8) reinforced the need of faculty to update computer skills as technology changes. Feldman (1982:26) submitted that there are presently two revolutions: a technological revolution

and "a revolution in human consciousness--a rethinking of the right relationship of people to work."

Organizational climate affects faculty communication and vitality. Cohen and Brawer (1987:83) explained that most faculty prefer to work autonomously and alone. Smith and Hunter (1988:47) commented that faculty members often do not interact with each other about educational matters, or share ideas and get feedback on solving classroom problems (Strong, et al., 1990). Faculty have become isolated within their institutions (Gaff, Jerry G., 1978: 45; Bennett, 1982:55; Gamson and Associates, 1984:84; Alfred, 1986:13; Cohen and Brawer, 1987:86; Gillespie, 1989:57). Harnish and Creamer (1985-86:36-37) related faculty needs to the organizational climate. They developed various personal hypotheses based on their study; three of these that deal with job involvement are the following:

1. Where faculty needs for variety in job tasks and skills exceed the opportunities available within their work for meeting those needs, faculty will experience disillusionment or alienation, which can take the form of criticism of work-role functions, norms, job conditions, co-workers or students;

2. Where both faculty need and job opportunity for variety are high, participation and importance placed on the work by faculty will be high (job-involved faculty);

3. Where both faculty need and job opportunity for variety are low, participation and importance placed on the work role by faculty will be low.

The implications from the results of Harnish and Creamer's study are that stagnation is "not an inevitable outcome" of

faculty remaining in the same job for many years as long as routinization is minimized through encouraging diversity of work tasks and skills, allowing variety in teaching opportunities, and providing a broad range of rewards for professional accomplishments. These approaches are supported by Schneider and Zalesny's (1981) findings that faculty in postsecondary education tend to be high on needs for self-actualization, achievement, and growth.

Various studies have been done on the community college and university faculty. Positive predictors of job satisfaction include job rewards, chronological age, good supervision, and the work itself (Filan, 1986:113-22). Diener's (1985:347-57) study found that high satisfaction was derived from student achievement, opportunities for intellectual growth, and autonomous and flexible working conditions and association with peers. Hutton's (1985:317-324) study found that community college faculty in Texas got their greatest satisfaction from relationships with supervisors and colleagues, along with the teaching itself. Cohen and Brawer (1982:83) reported on Purdy's 1972 study that found the hierarchy of faculty preferences in improving teaching with faculty colleagues as the highest potential source, with students as the second source, and with administration as the last source.

Most job dissatisfiers within postsecondary education encompass various relationships with administration. Policies, red tape, job conditions and salaries are

dissatisfiers (Seegmiller, 1977 and Diener, 1985). Davidson's (1976) study of faculty attitudes found that half of the respondents held negative attitudes toward college administrators. Shaw (1985:7) summarized the focal point of the dichotomy of faculty-administrator relationships by presenting the realities to the myth. He stated that

> The myth depicts the college or university as a true community of scholars where goals of faculty and administration harmoniously coexist . . . faculty are, in essence, academic entrepreneurs working in a communal environment not employees working in a bureaucratic organization.

Both Shaw (1985:10) and Schuster (1989:63) lamented that the quality of the academic workplace has slowly deteriorated during the past two decades.

Richardson (1988:32) suggested that faculty revitalization is a concept emerging from the staff development and maintained that

> While staff development concentrates primarily or exclusively on altering the knowledge base, faculty revitalization aims at improving faculty commitment to the priorities of the organization through engaging them in a variety of process-oriented behaviors which relate either to the achievement of organizational objectives or the professional improvement of the faculty member.

Vitality can be encouraged through tangible incentives, such as money, reassigned time, sabbaticals, and conference travel and sometimes through intangible incentives, such as recognition (Baldwin, 1985). Katzell, et al. (1980:290-294) and Ryder and Perabo (1985) summarized their research

findings on promoting high motivation, job satisfaction and productivity: the principal factors are recognition and reward for effective work. Solomon's (1987) study of two-year college faculty found that faculty need "a greater variety of information about how to meet their role expectations." Such information can increase job satisfaction and reduce job ambiguity.

Astin (1982:13) recommended a "value-added" concept to measuring institutional quality that

> quality of an undergraduate institution depends on the extent to which its educational policies serve to maximize the learner's knowledge of results and time on tasks. . . Faculty and administrators are also potential learners, in the sense that, with better feedback and more time on task, they can improve their skills, which will ultimately result in improved student learning.

Quinn (1990:16) interfaced these concepts with the concept of staff development:

> Staff development can and should be a guided search for new discoveries and learnings with which presenters and participants alike grow personally and professionally. The same is true for the classroom and the relationship between students and teachers.

Menges (1985:182) also noted the similarity for learning of students and faculty. Richardson, Blocker, and Bender (1972:80) stated that college faculty, staff, and students have "needs for self-esteem, self-respect, autonomy, achievement, and competence . . . [as well as] needs for status, recognition, appreciation, and the respect of their colleagues." Just as faculty need to be sensitive to different needs of students, the motivators

and activities of staff development need to be sensitive to differences in faculty. Staff development programs may not succeed if the options are limited to all faculty, irrespective of age, stage in academic career, and prior experience (Mehrotra, 1984). Sparks' (1979) and Swick's (1987) studies found that faculty who participate in staff development experiences are generally more proactive toward their teaching than their lesser involved peers.

Historically, the postsecondary organizational attitude has been that faculty and administrators are professionals and, therefore, are responsible to upgrade and maintain their academic expertise. They, not the institution, were responsible for their own professional and personal development (Centra, 1985:143). This organizational shift of responsibility has not always worked well. Lynton (1983:21) indicated that faculty are comfortable with status quo and need to explore beyond it.

Vaughan (1983:195) developed a broadened concept of presidential leadership in his reference to Maccoby's presentation to a 1979 meeting of the American Association of Higher Education. He maintained that if presidents and other key administrators did not develop skills in bringing out the best in people through creating an environment conducive to professional growth, professional development activities would be counter-productive. Reeser (1980:185) and Grove (1986:240) stated that training of new personnel and in-service upgrading of continuing personnel is an

important part of the "boss's job." Vaughan (1982b) proclaimed that one of a president's prime responsibilities is to prevent burnout of faculty, staff, and him/herself.

Faculty, having survived the student rigors of universities as an individual competitor, bring that heritage with them into the community college workplace where they work in the classrooms almost autonomously. Over time, such independence can produce dissatisfaction, stagnation, and the development of "dead wood." On the other hand, an open, supportive organizational climate can foster continued professional and personal development of faculty.

Administrator Preparation and Continued Vitality. The concept of administration in postsecondary education enfolds the paradox between administration and management. Eble (1978:2-4, 113-125) made the points that the word, "administrate" means "to serve" and that service to people is complex in both bureaucratic organizational models and shared governance models. Eble (1978:4) referred to Greenleaf's 1977 Servant Leadership in stating that "the great leader is seen as a servant first." In this regard, he claimed that numerous administrators devote their service to their immediate superior and to the institution in bureaucratic organizations; consequently, they seldom become leaders of faculty. Gaynes (1990:42) maintained that effective schools are likened to the effectiveness of their leadership.

The typical community college administrator has come from the faculty ranks and gained training on-the-job (Eble, 1978:1; Mayhew, 1979:36; Keller, 1983:171-172; McDade, 1987:1-2). Groth (1973:28) and McDade (1987:8-9) contended that training for administrators has been even less than for faculty, and that institutions of higher learning have not planned well for the development of their administration. Some institutions participated in the administrative internship programs during the 1960s (Cohen and Brawer, 1968 and Eble, 1978:7); a few programs have continued (Zabezensky, et al., 1985-86:54-59). But, overall there have been limited career planning opportunities for faculty moving into administration and for lower-level administrators moving upward in the organization (Bennis, 1973). In fact, not much has been written about career planning and opportunities for growth of administrators (Austin and Gamson, 1983:71).

Twombly's (1986) study of the labor market boundaries for community college presidents, chief academic officers, chief student affairs officers, and chief business officers found that eighty percent or more came from community colleges, ten percent or more from four-year colleges, and a small percentage from outside markets. She (1986:40) concluded that "the labor market for top-level administrative positions is closed." Based on that finding, she reviewed the option of career ladders within institutions but reiterated the concern that inbreeding of

two-year college administrators may provide barriers to innovative traditions that historically characterized the community colleges.

Many middle-level and upper-level administrators have advanced from a faculty position through a division chair position. Most of the writings about division chairs in two-years colleges occurred in the 1970s by writers who studied the complexities of their roles (Roueche, 1973; Lombardi, 1974; Hammons and Hunter, 1977; Sergiovanni, 1977; and Groner, 1978) or who studied their staff development training needs (Hammons and Wallace, 1977). Heimler (1967) reviewed the challenges of the department chair, who usually comes from the faculty and is supposed to prefer teaching to administration. Bennett (1982, 1983b) proclaimed that there are sudden adjustments and little training provided in making the transition from faculty to department chair. He (1982:55) recounted that

> a faculty member usually works alone and independent of colleagues, in both instructional and research activities. . . . Being a chairperson, however, . . . [one's] objectives are now achieved only by working through others, by spending much time in consultation, and by giving credit to others for what may be one's own ideas.

The lack of training results in decreased productivity in being efficient (Hammons and Wallace, 1977).

The transition from faculty to administration may be a most dramatic adjustment since division chairs are expected to be at least supportive of the faculty. The

concern that remains, however, is how well individuals make the transition, if at all.

The amount of training for administrators does not improve from the division chair upward through the hierarchy. Gould's (1964:94) study of the prior backgrounds of deans found that sixty-four percent had been chairpersons. Since little formal training has been provided most postsecondary administrators (Gaff, Festa, and Gaff, 1978), generally these administrators have functioned by maintaining the status quo and by keeping operations running smoothly (Cohen and Roueche, 1969). This type of administrating may have worked well during the 1960s; but a backlash came in the 1970s with collective bargaining legislation.

In addition, the knowledge and skills needed by administrators changed in the 1980s to include skills at balancing forces of coalitions, planning changing enrollment projections, and working with stabilized or limited expenditures (Alfred, Elsner, and LeCroy, 1984). Beck and Hillmar (1986:xiv) and Leas and Rodriquez's (1987:97-101) listed new administrative skills needed; they are far broader in scope and interface with the rapid changes occurring in society.

The major changes within society impact the functioning of an educational institution and its management of resources. McDade (1987:9) maintained that

> administrators who spend their entire careers in one or two institutions need professional development opportunities . . . Such executives need to go outside their institutions to refine their management and leadership talents, and professional development programs.

Corbally and Holmberg-Wright (1981:385) warned that a single individual who has worked for a number of years in the same key administrative position may not be changing in relationship to the needed, evolving position requirements. They stated that regular reviews need to be made of administrators and their assignments so that assignment changes can be made as part of a professional growth process. Miller (1981:410) stated that both administrative and faculty evaluation should have the same main purposes of "improving professional performance and judging professional competence."

The presidency of universities and colleges have been extensively written about and studied, as evidenced by the lengthy annotated bibliography of Eells and Hollis (1961). In fact, as Green and Kellogg (1982:40) reflected, "research on academic careers has focused almost exclusively on the presidency." The studies of Cohen and March (1974) and Socolow (1978) corroborated in showing that individuals becoming American college presidents in the 1960s and early 1970s had a background of being a "local" in the geographic area. They were the "builders" (Vaughan, 1982b) at a time when faculties of smaller institutions shared enthusiasm for the institutional

mission (Vaughan and Associates, 1983). Because of rapid growth of two-year colleges, fifty-four percent of the presidents came from administration positions with no experience as a faculty member (Twombly, 1987:15).

The next generation of presidents have had to adapt to other changes, such as "management of diminishing resources, shrinking student enrollments, aging faculty, and decreasing student skills" (Baker, Roueche, and Rose, 1988:36) and collective bargaining (Stalcup and Thompson, 1980). Richardson (1986) in reviewing Vaughan's The Community College Presidency reflected that the additional challenges of today's presidents face in earning their power and in sharing power with trustees, faculty, and others. Eaton (1981) discussed the other new challenges to present and future presidents: the change in student characteristics and curriculum demands, the development of faculty professionalism, and the deterioration of the college's hierarchical administrative organization.

Robertson (1976:4) observed that most of the studies and writings about the presidents described the kinds of skills and background needed in an anecdotal way rather than dealing with the processes that develop the skills. Vogt (1988:48) confirmed it another decade later. She studied the training and development of CEOs and Human Resource Managers by comparing the methodologies used and interests applied in developing their skills, abilities, and knowledge. She found that Human Resource Managers

relied substantially more than CEOs on seminars and that CEOs development most heavily focused on reading current literature. Moore (1985) found that presidents and top-level administrators also rely heavily upon external professional development activities through state, regional or national associations.

For many years, the training of all levels of administrators seems to have been gained either through doctorate programs of universities, through some national/ state associations, or through an informal "apprenticeship to older administration" (Cohen and Roueche, 1969). Austin and Gamson (1983:46) commented that no training for new college presidents is available except through seminars of the American Council on Education. Baldridge, et al. (1978) stated that universities and colleges need to include administrator development programs as part of their long-range plans.

The need to improve the preparation and training of administrators is supported by Schultz (1968), Knapp (1969), and Henderson (1970). The amount of attention directed toward administrative training is reflected in a limited number of books on the subject. Only a few writers, such as Eble (1978); Jedamus, Peterson and Associates (1981); Keller (1983); and Beck and Hillmar (1986), have written books specifically directed toward enhancing management skills, practices, and strategies of postsecondary administrators. It is unknown

to what degree those books and other management books from the business and social science disciplines have been read for self-development by today's administrators. Professional development of all levels of administrators is in a "disorganized state" (McDade, 1987:89) and demands a national training effort (Moore, 1971). It should be a concern of the academic community, as well as the taxpaying public, that the managers of educational institutions are not being trained for their increasingly complex jobs.

The paucity of educational studies on administrative attitudes and organizational development in community colleges when contrasted to the wealth of literature on faculty development provides a concern. The educational mindset appears to be that administrators gain management competencies and skills through osmosis just as today's faculty are to get teaching skills through osmosis. The implications suggest many trial and error experiences, reduced productivity, and lowered quality interactions by all connected.

In the absence of educational studies, the business and organization literature needs to be relied upon. Drucker (1982) and Levinson (1981) recognized the need for managers to get updating on professional education and training periodically. Weintraub (1978) recommended that CEOs need to get additional training because they also can become obsolete with the changing ways of interacting with

people and the contemporary trends. Dill, Crowston, and Elton (1965) forecast that senior managers need to update their knowledge base to help them with planning for and managing in the future decade. Hague (1974) explained that managers need both technological development and psychological development through time. What holds true for managers in the private sector, should hold true for educational administrators: they need additional course work and other types of training to train, maintain, and/or update them.

Classified Staff Preparation and Continued Vitality. The academic literature has not dwelt on preparation of classified staff for community colleges. Barthlow (1973) was an early supporter of including classified staff in staff development programs. Corbally and Holmberg-Wright, (1981:386) maintained that people with a wide range of skills, hired into college settings to contribute to the attainment of institutional purposes, should not be overlooked. MacKenzie and Urich (1984:137-139) and Orlich (1989:84) concurred, indicating that opportunities to grow on the job improves service to the institution.

Morrisey (1983:95) identified two goals for effective employee development: (1) improving performance in present jobs and (2) preparing the employee for possible future opportunities. A job attitude survey of classified staff at Los Angeles City College was done by Stine (1977). He

noted that many staff development needs for classified staff differ according to subgroups. However, an overall finding was that a staff development program was needed to inform classified staff about promotion and pay raise policies and procedures. Cato's (1977) needs assessment of classified staff at College of Alameda reflected a need for orientation and inservice development for new employees.

In the South County Community College District, a high school diploma and job skills relevant to the job have been used. This area of classified personnel is diverse in background, education, and skills levels. Except for, perhaps, the constant of communication skills, there are no real constituencies of training needs, such as teaching for the faculty and management skills for the administrators. An overview of the literature revealed that pre-service and in-service staff development for classified staff has been insufficient.

Rewards and Attitudes Interacting with Staff Development. This section has three parts. The first part reviews rewards to faculty. The second part deals with attitudes of faculty and administration toward staff development. Part three reviews rewards to administrators and classified staff.

The literature provided a variety of viewpoints on the priorities set by faculty and administration regarding faculty development. In the 1970s, administrators provided

staff development programs to get faculty to move away from traditional lecture and to buy into such learning strategies as mastery learning and individualized learning. Johnson and Johnson (1977:83-89) described strategies used. Titlow (1980:3) was one writer of the 1970s who lamented the apathy syndrome for staff development activities.

Christensen's (1975) study of three Illinois community colleges found that administrators and faculty perceived important development needs for faculty in a similar manner. His investigative instrument did not delineate categories of development; instead, it focused on classroom activities and institutional support services. Titlow's (1980) study also compared faculty and administrative perceptions of staff development needs for faculty. Cohen and Brawer (1982: 79-80) commented that while faculty prefer courses and programs in their teaching field at university sites, administrators prefer that faculty attend on-campus workshops centering on pedagogy and on concerns related to the college.

Jacqueline Snyder (1988) studied the effectiveness of staff development among selected community colleges participating in the League for Innovation through administrators and faculty. She used the Bergquist and Phillips areas of Professional Development, Instructional Development, and Personal Development. Snyder's findings showed that there was a significant difference in perceptional views between administrators and faculty regarding

personal development; faculty believed personal development contributed to the improvement of instruction more than did administrators. It should be noted, however, that the concept of personal development included computer literacy and other technology training, along with such items as Wellness, Financial Planning, and Recognition for Excellence.

Faculty Rewards. Rewards for faculty come through tangible and intangible means. Rewards serve as the controllers and motivators. According to Clark, Boyer, and Corcoran (1985),

> reward systems tend to be tied to control systems. . . just which control systems and reward systems affect the vitality of which faculty favorably or unfavorably . . . is not well understood.

Course work, not on-campus workshops, seminars or other staff development activities, has historically served as the means for rising on the salary schedule (American Federation of Teachers, 1990:11-12). Stout (1988) recounted that faculty aim to take course work for three reasons: (1) maintaining certification, (2) movement on the "step and column" salary schedule, and (3) career enhancement to enable them to leave education or to enter other areas of education. He claimed that the salary and certification system did not address areas of purpose and quality. Centra (1985:143) explained that "colleges have historically expected faculty members to bear the responsibility for their own professional and personal development." A substantial portion of that development

has been done through course work and attendance at professional meetings.

Faculty have been rewarded for longevity through the vertical steps on salary schedules, based on years of service (Monroe, 1976:264 and Cohen and Brawer, 1982:80). Cole (1982:49) concluded that faculty reward systems need to better recognize and remunerate teaching. McMillen (1987:15) referred to Wallace who had exclaimed that faculty reward structures must change to take into account other work beyond the specific teaching tasks. The impact and motivation that the longevity steps provide is unclear in terms of productivity and quality of teaching. According to Centra (1977), the 1976 Centra and Creech's national study of student ratings of 9,000 teachers in 100 colleges produced the following findings: (1) students rated first and second year teachers lowest; (2) students rated faculty with three to twelve years highest; and (3) students rated teachers with thirteen or more years as being more in line with second year teachers. The findings of this study have implications for salary schedules as well as staff development planning, implementation, and evaluation.

The growth of community colleges during the 1950s and 1960s allowed the infusion of new faculty into the system to provide institutional renewal (Vogler, 1980:35; Centra, 1985:142; Valek, 1986:93). That means of faculty development has changed. The growth of the 1960s and early 1970s slowed down while more faculty reached the top of the

salary scale. The present salary schedule incentives have conveyed to faculty wrong and/or inadequate signals on what kinds of performance or productivity are really important to the college (Roueche and Watkins, 1982; LeBoeuf, 1985).

Attitudes Interactive with Staff Development. Faculty professionalism has an historical basis. Shaw (1985:5-6) debunked the "myth of Academe" that administrators and legislators exploit faculty:

> faculty in America lead lives devoted to selfless pursuit of knowledge in institutions carefully organized to support that pursuit . . . faculty work for the intrinsic pleasure of the work itself and willingly forego greater material rewards that men and women with their credentials could earn elsewhere.

Such needs for faculty reward, recognition, and self-actualization were identified in the 1960s. Garrison (1970:GARR-1A-2A) traveled to numerous junior colleges in 1965-66 to discuss professional problems with faculty. He found that in addition to salary, benefits, and status, faculty included three factors in job satisfaction: (1) regular opportunities for dialogue with colleagues, (2) additional study in the disciplines, (3) continued growth and intellectual stimulation on the job.

Cohen and Brawer (1982:66) indicated that the primary responsibility of community college faculty has been to teach, not do research. They (1987:86) summarized the problem of faculty being separated from research:

> The isolation of the community college instructors makes it difficult for them to maintain awareness of new ideas coming into their

> field. A faculty that does not participate in academic research tends not to maintain current awareness of the products of research conducted elsewhere. A faculty that is little aware of patterns of curriculum and instruction in neighboring institutions must devise for itself any change in teaching of curricular strategies.

Blackburn, et al. (1980:462) related that while most research on scholarship has focused on publications, little attention has been given to "works of art, creative curriculum reform, adoption of new teaching styles, development of new courses, or other activities that might be called 'scholarly'." Weaver (1986:51) supported Finkelstein's (1984:89-91) perception that the main reason community college faculty haven't participated in research is that they have been socialized into thinking of scholarship as disciplinary research. Part of that socialization has evolved through such writers as Hart (1967:92).

These and the following writers of the 1980s have provided new support for broadening the concept of scholarship. Lord (1988a, 1988b) reported on George Vaughan's presentation at a New Jersey statewide conference wherein he stated that

> community colleges cannot achieve their full potential as institutions of higher education until scholarship occupies a prominent place in their philosophy [and modus operandi].

Lord (1988a) proposed that the concept of scholarship extend beyond research leading to include such activities as "developing innovative teaching materials/methods, writing articles/monographs/reviews/books, delivering

papers/colloquia/lectures, creating art/poetry/prose/music/films/consulting/testimony, and writing impact studies/grants/reports. Parilla (1987:111-112) emphasized the importance of the "scholar-professor" as a learner and teacher; he provided eight scholarly activities for which Montgomery Community College in Maryland allocates reassigned time to faculty. Cross and Angelo's (1988) classroom research projects supported, promoted, and broadened these concepts by involving faculty in researching the students in their courses. Millman (1983) and Atkin (1989) explained that substantive and continuing improvement in education could not be easily sustained unless classroom-related research became integrated as an important responsibility of the teaching profession.

Faculty, too, have needs for self-fulfillment, according to Blocker, Bender, and Richardson (1972). Lord (1988b:108) emphasized that "community college faculty need to pursue scholarly inquiry as a means of rejuvenation and academic enhancement." Demonstrated scholarship should be required by hiring institutions and rewarded through salary increases (Mayhew, 1979:242). This redefinition of scholarship offers new avenues for faculty reward, recognition, and self-actualization.

Staff development programs need to be institutionalized (Terrell, 1984) through policy development (Caron, 1979) and by being integrated with the reward systems. As early as the 1960s, Thornton (1966) supported

the concept of using added pay as an incentive for staff development. Hamlin (1980:11-12) pointed out that faculty development may not be fully utilized if the program is not coupled with either the faculty reward structure or the faculty evaluation effort. One of his study's findings was that faculty from colleges and universities valued salary raises as more important than staff development. This finding has implications for collective bargaining from the administrative side and the faculty side. Both sides have been highly unimaginative and irresponsible to the taxpayers and the students by not experimenting with new ways to incorporate professional development in salary negotiations.

Starting in 1976, the California legislature through the Chancellor's Office offered the option of Flex Days to faculty of community colleges. One to fifteen instructional days could be replaced with staff development days. Over half of the 107 community colleges have opted for Flex Days and applied to the California Community College Chancellor's Office for permission and bargained for them. Bishop (1976:16) advocated that time be allotted for staff development and instructional improvement. Bender and Lukenbill (1984) recommended that contracts with faculty require one day per month for staff development and that internal funding support those professional development activities. Lavrakas (1980-81) described the California community colleges that adopted the Flexible Calendar.

In any case, salary incentives can be used to motivate part-time faculty to participate in staff development (Pedras, 1985a:75 and Shawl, 1984). On the other hand, many part-time faculty are willing to pay for particular staff development activities. Pedras (1985b:12) found that "part-timers would be willing to pay a cost of $10.00 to $20.00 for a [systematic staff development] program." At Fullerton College in California, part-time faculty have to earn one-fifth the Flex Days credit hours of full-time faculty or four flex credit hours to receive their full pay for a term (Kelly, 1990a).

The present K-12 based reward system for salaries of educational institutions does not provide motivators or incentives to the people of the organization. Longevity pay, or seniority pay, does not provide incentives to perform well (Goldberg, 1980:448). Wilson (1980) maintained that such across-the-board pay raises perpetuate mediocrity in the workplace. Historically, community colleges have expected that faculty professionals would maintain their knowledge and skills relevant to teaching young people about their discipline. The salary schedules, modelled after the K-12 system, provided vertical longevity steps with an underlying presumption that faculty would automatically be better. The horizontal steps of the salary schedules have rewarded faculty for taking university courses. The motivation systems and reward systems should be broadened, along with the traditional

definition of scholarship, to expand the concept of the professional. These considerations, integrated with the curriculum design of the staff development program, can facilitate the improvement and maintenance of effective and relevant classroom instruction. Some colleges have developed concepts of merit pay to motivate participation in staff development (Hudgins, 1985 and Andrews, 1986a).

An alternative to longevity pay is the concept of merit pay, which has been around for a long time (Holloway, 1988:33). Its history has been reviewed by Dickerson, Norby, and Schroder (1984), Murnane and Cohen (1986) and Andrews (1986b and 1987).

There are different approaches to merit pay. One merit pay system is to reward the top ten to twenty-five percent of the faculty; another method is to have an individual faculty contract for merit pay by setting/attaining goals (Shreeve, et al., 1985) or for fulfilling a self-development plan (O'Banion, 1973). Another system emphasized meritorious performance; it used the midpoint between the minimum and maximum salary range as the starting place for rewarding employee performance beyond normal expectations (Goldberg, 1980:448-451) or other point systems (McKay, 1986; Donnelly, 1984; Mountain Empire Community College, 1985). Kanter (1987) recommended a contribution-based payment system. Professional activities beyond the classroom should be integrated in the merit pay system for full-time faculty (Wilson, 1980) and

part-time faculty (Long, 1978 and Santa Fe Community College, 1989). Clough (1989: 23-24) studied Professional Development or Incentive Increments as an alternative to longevity steps for long-term faculty at a two-year college. Robert Anderson Jr. (1984) reported on a merit system for all employees. Various methods have been suggested to promote motivators into the reward system; making such change will be difficult.

The K-12 system has been experimenting with merit pay and career ladders as motivators for staff development and teaching effectiveness. Florida piloted a merit pay system in 1983; it was abolished and replaced by a career ladder plan; few other states have maintained their merit pay systems (Astuto and Clark, 1985:37). Newton (1987:9-12) provided the different levels--probationary through apprenticeship to career levels--used in career ladders and described the programs of five states. There is little in the literature about merit pay or career ladders in postsecondary education.

Administrator and Classified Staff Rewards. Although different colleges have different approaches, a generalization is that once placed on a salary schedule, increases in pay are gained through either yearly salary increments or longevity steps. The CEO negotiates salary and benefits directly with the Board of Trustees. Although no literature was available on the history or rationale of the salary schedules for the administrators and classified

staff, levels of administrative compensation were discussed by Austin and Gamson (1983:55-56). Cooper's (1981:16) study of administrative salaries at five midwestern colleges did not find any motivation-oriented rewards or incentives.

Tradition has long lingered in the salary schedules of all segments of community college personnel. The schedules are simple to administer because they provide for automatic and procedural adjustments. For the most part, salary schedules of community colleges reward longevity and do not support and/or reinforce continuous growth and development of personnel over the career stages.

Components of Staff Development Programs

Since staff development interfaces with organizational development, it is paramount that all personnel, not just one segment, such as faculty, become involved in learning and thinking. Effective staff development programs need to be a systematic flow of efforts over time, rather than one-shot meetings (Grove, 1986:239; Newton, 1987:20; Loucks-Horsley, et al., 1987:7). The components of the programs may change in importance as the stages of development within the constituencies change (Cooper, 1981:14).

Jacqueline Snyder (1988:16-24) provided an historical perspective of faculty development and the catalysts for its emergence from the 1960s through her review of the

literature of three main segments of staff development: (1) Professional Development, (2) Instructional Development, and (3) Personal Development, based on the Bergquist and Phillips model (1975, 1977). Various other studies, such as Magnesen and Parker's (1988), also used these segments. Gaff (1975) included organizational development as necessary to create an effective organizational environment.

The AB 1725 legislation did not categorize its nine criteria into the three areas even though the criteria did encompass the three areas. Furthermore, the AB 1725 legislation included a criteria that embraced a personal development goal. Faculty development of the 1970s concentrated on instruction (Gaff, 1975; Centra, 1976; Freedman, et al., 1979; Mitzel, 1982; and Eble and McKeachie, 1985); it ignored personal aspects. Schuster (1989:61-62) claimed that past omission of personal factors explained why staff development programs have been ineffective. As characterized by California's legislation, the movement of the 1980s broadened its scope and included personal dimensions (Forman, 1989:11). Traditional professional development activities were inadequate (Forman, 1989:11).

Different Options for Staff Development Programs

This section delineates staff development alternatives. The recipients of faculty and staff

development programs need to be involved in the development of their activities. Faculty and staff are more responsible to development programs in which they have been intricately involved in planning, as opposed to imposed programs prepared by administrators (Forman, 1989:17). The following activities support alternatives to staff development.

In-house Workshops to Improve Organizational Climate. In the past two years, some community colleges have implemented workshops or retreats dealing with shared governance and/or collegial administration, such as Glendale College (Scull, 1988b), Long Beach City College (Alfano, et al., 1990), and Chabot and Las Positas colleges. The success or limited success of these California activities may reflect Virginia Commonwealth University's two-year experience with two such retreats to improve communication and decision-making practices (Wergin, Mason, and Munson, 1976:293-296).

Faculty Orientation. Although not documented well, community colleges have at least a one-day Orientation or Institute Day or Convocation Day for all faculty and administrators. Sometimes some classified staff and part-time faculty are included. The activities of the day vary; Banks (1986) described Mission College's. Many colleges have a series of meetings between administrators and new faculty during the first year. Florida Community College at Jacksonville (FCCJ) involves all segments of full-time personnel in its New Employee Orientation; the program

provides "in-depth information about FCCJ, its governance, its strategic directions and its plans for the future" (Jackson, 1990). Both McDougle (1980:22) and Parsons (1978) recommended a tour of the facilities as part of the orientation of part-time faculty.

Part-Time Faculty Orientations. Most colleges have an evening orientation for new part-time faculty in order to introduce them to the fundamentals of enrollment record-keeping, grading practices, and employment benefits. McDougle (1980:20-23), Rabalais and Perritt (1983), and Kelly (1990a) described model programs for new part-time faculty. The data from Hoffman and Pool's (1979) needs assessment indicated that part-time faculty also wanted continuing, but short-term workshops and meetings.

Handbooks are useful to new personnel in getting familiar with the organization. They should be used for full-time faculty, part-time faculty (Montgomery College, 1975; Pedras, 1985b:13), as well as administrators and classified staff (Kintzer, 1982 and 1983). El Camino College (1989) and Mt. San Antonio College (1988) are two of the few community colleges that provide a handbook for classified staff.

Sabbaticals are one of the oldest means that faculty have had to increase competence during their long-term tenure. Blackburn, et al. (1980), Eble and McKeachie (1985), and Forman (1989) explained that sabbaticals are oriented more toward discipline research than toward

improving teaching skills. Some colleges have sabbaticals for administrators; Corbally and Holmberg-Wright (1981) particularly recommended them for academic executives.

Off-site Conferences and Conventions allow institutions to send out its personnel to get information (Hart, 1967:92 and Phillips, 1986:48-49) and to network with peers (McDade, 1987:47-58, 61-63).

In-house Workshops allow a variety of learning formats using internal expertise or external resources (Odiorne, 1987:120-125 and Cothran, 1988:669-670). Wergin, Mason, and Munson (1976:291-292) determined that workshops, which were responsive to faculty needs, on simulations and self-instructional packages quite successful at an urban university. Heimler (1967:158-163) suggested seminars as the means of in-service training for department chairs.

Classroom Research has been designed and implemented in various community colleges either through the Cross and Angelo (1988) program or by individual colleges (Kanter, 1984 and Scull, 1988b). Gable and Rogers (1987) suggested that such research is a necessary ingredient to a professional faculty. Ryder and Perabo (1985) encouraged mini-grants for research. Such internal grants can be in the form of stipends and/or reassigned time to do classroom research (Cross and Angelo, 1988) or problem solving grants directed toward institutional needs (Oliva, 1986:44-46 and Burne, Bundy, and McArthur, 1989:43-49) or scholarly inquiry (Lord, 1988b:109).

Mentoring has been used in varying degrees in business (Phillips, 1986:47-48 and Hennecke, 1988) and in education for full-time and part-time faculty and administration (Queralt, 1981; Pedras, 1985b; Harnish, 1986; and Seldin, 1988). Fagan and Walter (1982:116) and Roueche (1990) reported benefits of mentoring for new faculty as increased self-confidence and cooperation among personnel, with the mentor acting as a sounding board and as a supporter of creativity. Part-time faculty can mentor each other (Elioff, 1983) or be mentored by full-time faculty (Pedras, 1985b:5 and Carson and Deming, 1990). Eble and McKeachie (1985:19) explained the University of California program where emeriti professors serve as mentors. Galvez-Hjornevik (1985) reviewed the literature on teacher mentors. The California State Department of Education (1983) reported on its progress with teacher mentoring. Vaughan (1989) presented the pros and cons of mentoring for college presidents.

Externships, Leaves of Absence, allow faculty to work for one year full-time in an external job in business and industry related to their teaching field (Bridge, 1980:35-38; Kiefer, 1984; Hill, 1985; Douglas, 1983:64-65; Patton and Palmer, 1985:162; Carvell, 1988).

Visitations to Other Colleges and Universities allow and promote new contacts and exchanging of information/ideas (Garrison, 1967:40-41 and Schultz, 1978).

Visitations to Other Work Sites, such as employers of students or companies with parallel jobs, allow faculty, administrators, and classified staff to gain and exchange information.

Job Exchanges, particularly for faculty, have been promoted to the community colleges by the California Academic Senate and Kelly (1990b) and to higher education (Valek, 1986:94-95) and with business/industry (Van Dyke, 1983 and Adams and Whiteman, 1983). Fullbright Fellowships for faculty are available for foreign exchanges. Short-term, internal interdisciplinary exchanges broaden perspectives.

Job Rotations allow enrichment of skills and cross training (Morrisey, 1983:100 and Phillips, 1986:46).

Change of Teaching Specializations from one narrow field into broader fields allows opportunities for new learning (Menges, 1985:184).

Internship and Fellowship programs allow faculty and administrative pre-service and/or in-service training (Roueche and Herrscher, 1970:CEN-7-CEN13A).

In-house Administrative Internships for Faculty on a short-term basis would allow faculty to broaden their perceptions of the organization from an administrative viewpoint (Austin and Gamson, 1983:70).

Internally Developed ADA Courses for faculty, administration, and/or classified staff allow the institution to determine and provide training (Cato, 1977).

Outside Certification or Unit Courses are required for initial qualifications to work and for continued updating of information and application for various job types (Detwiler, 1985:42-43).

University Courses of traditional sequence or of short-term importance can facilitate continuing education in disciplines (Lindsay, Morrison, and Kelley, 1974:20) and in various aspects of career development for faculty, administrators, and classified staff. Kanter (1984:6) reported on the successful faculty evaluations of the Laredo State University courses specifically oriented toward junior college faculty. Cervero (1988:81) remarked that such continuing education for educators has not been viewed as an important function of universities.

National Institutes and Internships provide training to faculty and administrators who wish to develop administrative expertise (McDade, 1987:33-50).

Faculty/Staff Development Centers provide computer and other resources to personnel. Gaff (1975:187-228) and Freedman, et al. (1979:viii) described the faculty development centers of the 1970s as focusing on behavioral objectives, design of learning experiences, and applications of alternative learning situations. Thornbury (1974), Sparks (1979:13-18), and Mulkeen and Tetenbaum (1987:85-86) described helpful teaching centers, which can be used by part-time as well as full-time faculty (Lhota, 1976). Arrsola (1983) promoted use of centers for staff

development, particularly for new faculty (Miami-Dade Community College District, 1989).

Audiocassette or Video Programs are available for self-paced learning from various private-sector companies (Morrisey, 1983:101-102) for improving and motivating personnel (Posner and Burlingham, 1988:44).

Distribution of Reading Matter and/or access to articles and books about administration or teaching/learning provides a shared source of new or reinforcing information (Morrisey, 1983:102).

Workshops on Computer Literacy for faculty, staff, and students has been a concern expressed in the literature. The National Education Association's (NEA) Special Committee on Educational Technology (1989) reported thirteen recommendations to integrate technology into the instructional environment. One observation in the report was that the increasing usage of technology in the classroom is influenced by the personal usage of computers by the faculty. More access to computers for experimentation (Armistead, Vogler, and Branch, 1987) and for faculty uses related to instruction, personal scholarship, and administrative tasks (Durbak and Sadnylzky, 1984 and McMillen, 1987) were recommended.

Independent Consulting allows community college faculty a broadening option (Furniss, 1984 and Boyer and Lewis 1985:177-197).

Outstanding Teacher/Staff Awards may be used more in universities than community colleges. They are a means to identify and recognize good contributions to the organization. They serve as signals to the organization that good teaching is highly valued (Todd-Mancillas, 1988:69) and rewarded (Irby and Kuramoto, 1986:16). This kind of recognition has not been a priority in community colleges. Astin and Lee (1970:AS&LE12A-13A) report on a 1966 study which showed that only thirteen percent of the junior colleges gave outstanding teacher awards in comparison to the fifty-two to seventy-three percent of university departments. Hudgins (1985) also recommended service awards to staff members.

Career Counseling provides faculty with the options of exchange programs, developing new curricula, or leaving teaching (Schuster, 1989:66) so they can better cope with their one-stage career (Caldwell, 1986) in a "one-life, one-career profession" (Sarason, 1977). Furniss (1981:8-15), Charland and Marshak (1988:99-101) and Sorcinelli (1986:12) advocated that long-term faculty have opportunities to explore new and/or different career opportunities.

Classroom Observations allow new faculty to view demonstrated techniques of others and learn from them (Lacey, 1983:101 and Adams and Hamm, 1986:22). In addition, observations by colleagues can be used by

longer-term faculty for enhancing delivery of instruction (Smith, 1988:11).

Videotaping of Instructional Presentations allows faculty to critique their own delivery skills (Lacey, 1983; Morrison, 1985; Roueche, 1987; Miller, 1989).

Wellness Programs promote good health, assist with rehabilitation (Schuster, 1989:66), and deal with stress (Mallinger, 1986:17).

Growth Contracts for faculty (Heie and Sweet, 1984:147-161 and Duke, 1990, 71-75) are a modified form of Drucker's (1954) Management By Objectives. They allow faculty to develop an individualized plan for continuing professional and personal development (Gross, 1978).

Retraining into a Different Discipline allows renewal of faculty through the study in a new discipline. Such retraining also helps the institution with shifting enrollments (Mayhew, 1979:228-232; Carleo, 1985; Petrovich and Hexter, 1986; and Kelly, 1987:22-23).

There are many means and processes that can be used to train and upgrade new and continuing personnel. Gagne and Briggs (1979:13) explained that the "needs for instruction must be investigated as a first step" in designing any kind of instructional system. They suggested that all problems or gaps between what is and what should be may not be solvable by education or training. Burleigh (1989) compared the relationship of the development of a community college course to the development of a staff development

activity. Furniss (1981:13) reinforced the concept that such programs accommodate the various needs of faculty and the needs of the organization.

The concept of renewal of people or institutions is different from development. Renewal may evolve through changed opportunities, rewards, or locations of work (Menges, 1985:182). The need for renewal is an individual matter because individual motivators differ based upon career stages and interests (Furniss, 1981:10-13; Blackburn, 1985:55-97; Eble and McKeachie, 1985:16-20; Valek 1986:94). Furthermore, faculty increasingly resist change with age (Mayhew, 1979.) Furniss' (1981:10-11) discussion and Chell's (1987:30-54) review of literature on age and change capsulized the concepts that people at different stages of their life cycle will be motivated differently. Ball and Goodson (1985) also examined teaching career periods and determined three malaise-prone periods: 5 to 7 years after starting teaching, 12 to 15 years of full-time teaching, and pre-retirement period. Niagara Community College's Staff Development Plan (McCardell and Willment, 1987:6) addressed three career phases: early career, mid-career, and late career. An effective staff development program needs to address these physiological and chronological differences.

Extensive planning, implementation, and evaluating of staff development activities has been fostered by the funding provided by AB 1725. The dilemma of the community

colleges is determining whether or not this late 1980s staff development movement is just another political fad or a real thrust to institutionalize staff development in the organizational structure of the community colleges. Baldwin and Blackburn (1983) explained that faculty development programs have not maintained consistency in institutional emphasis because they have not become a permanent part in the organizational structure of postsecondary education institutions. Schuster (1989:63) recounted that well-conceived faculty development programs can be highly cost effective. Kanter (1984:5) concluded that a faculty development program could not be deemed complete unless both a schedule of continuous reinforcement and rewards were built into the system.

Siegel's (1980) study of twenty liberal arts colleges found that individual research and study projects, attending professional meetings, and taking courses outside one's discipline as the highest rated professional development activities.

The emphasis of development on one portion of the personnel--the faculty--of the community colleges proved ineffective during the 1970s. O'Connell's (1983:673) examination of staff development policies at eight colleges and a closer study of faculty at four of these institutions concluded that faculty are inner-motivated persons whose professional values direct them toward rewards intrinsic to teaching; consequently, faculty development programs had

minor effects on faculty behavior. If staff development programs don't change behaviors, the organizational climate needs to be examined.

The nature of community college institutions need to change. They, along with all educational institutions, need to be humanized (Cole, 1982:49). An essential part of the humanization processes starts with the induction of new personnel. That induction should include three basic factors: (1) procedural administration of college policies, (2) mission and goals of the community college, and (3) teaching/learning strategies and techniques. Such standardized coverage of information establishes an operational basis from which employees can integrate into the system.

From that point, continued in-service training facilitates the updating with technology and demographic change as well as the development of the individual as part of a greater whole. Heermann (1976:vii) stated

> Excellent community college education is not the product of superb individual administrators or faculty members acting alone; rather, it is the result of a unique blending of a diverse constituency--administrators, students, support staff, and teachers . . . A synergistic effect can be the result wherein the contribution of the team is greater than the sum of the individual human resources.

It is essential for staff development activities to integrate the three segments of personnel (Magnesen and Parker, 1988:16-17 and Smith, 1989:6). In fact, staff development can no longer be a fad or luxury if

if community colleges are to fully use their resources (Lhota, 1976:1).

In order to survive, institutions must be addressing their purposes and providing a demanded product or service. The input ingredients have been changing increasingly rapidly since the 1960s. Staff development is no longer a luxury; it has become an almost too late necessity. All personnel need job orientation and continued training to promote competency and individual satisfaction so they can serve the organization productively. In addition, a spectrum of opportunities need to be available from which personnel of various ages and stages in their careers can select on the bases of self-actualization, self-improvement or improvements in monetary compensation. The salary system rewards all types of personnel, except the CEO, for longevity. Motivators have to be supplied by the organizational climate and/or the reward system to focus personnel on the changes needed to keep meeting the changing missions, philosophies, and goals of the community college. The need for long-term motivators to institutionalize staff development has been a continuing problem and will remain the factor for institutionalization of staff development.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains a presentation of the design of the study and a discussion of the procedures and methodology. The first section reviews the design of the study and the research questions. Section two contains an overview of the procedures and methodologies used in the design and development of the needs assessment instrument. The third section describes the layout and content of the survey instrument. The population studied is presented in section four. Procedures and methodology for data collection are identified in section five. The sixth section describes the data analysis. The last section is a summary.

Design of the Study

The study was designed as a case study of perceived staff development needs of the personnel of two California community colleges in a San Francisco/Oakland Bay Area district. A staff development needs assessment was developed and distributed to full-time and part-time administration, faculty and classified staff to elicit responses regarding their demographics, perceptions of the organizational climate, interest in various types of staff development activities and topics, methods that would

better motivate them to get more involved with the staff development function, and participation in staff development activities during the past two years.

The research questions involved

1. What information and skills are needed (and wanted) by faculty and staff to update/upgrade dissemination of information and interfacing of communications in order to meet the missions of the colleges among the multicultural segments?

2. What types of activities are needed (and wanted) by faculty and staff to update/upgrade dissemination of information and interfacing of communications in order to meet the missions of the colleges among the multicultural segments?

3. What motivators are wanted by faculty and staff to update/upgrade their perceived staff development needs within the context of the organizational operating environment?

Questionnaire Design and Development

The following procedures and methods were used to design and develop the staff development needs assessment questionnaire.

1. The literature, including a DIALOG search, was reviewed for a usable needs assessment instrument which had been used in national, state, and/or community college staff development studies.

2. Needs assessments which had been used in California community colleges for enactment of AB 1725 were requested from the California Community College Chancellor's Office Staff Development Specialist and from staff development coordinators throughout the state.

3. The twelve-person Staff Development Council and its five input committees reviewed the various needs assessment instruments found in the review of the literature and through statewide contacts.

4. Attempts were made to consult with the new chancellor/president about his view of institutional needs in relationship to the kinds of information he would like from the needs assessment, but the newness and pressures of his job did not permit his input.

5. The institutional research coordinator was consulted with support from the chancellor/president about development of an internally developed questionnaire, since no questionnaire was found that would fulfill the district's needs in acquiring sufficient and useful information.

6. The staff development coordinator prepared a preliminary draft, using Wang software, for the committees and Council to review for layout and content. Draft 1 was setup on a multiple choice format as used in 1988 and 1989 by various California community colleges, Hamlin (1980), Hall and Petrie (1987).

7. Draft 2 was a revision based upon the input of the committee chairs who comprise the Council and reviewed by the Institutional Research Coordinator who recommended severe changes, particularly shortening the section on organizational climate.

8. The text for Draft 3 was converted from Wang software to WordPerfect software since the district's Graphics Services Department required all text to be delivered to them in that software and since the Institutional Research Coordinator had suggested a format with consistent choices for most responses, such as that used by Novak (1974:197-203), Robertson (1976:57-64), Titlow (1980:104-108), Manley and Others (1986:99-128), Vogt (1988:62-63), and Rancho Santiago College (1989).

9. The format of Draft 3 was reconstructed in WordPerfect and developed so that respondents had four basic choices in expressing their interest and intent to participate in staff development activities.

10. A initial pilot was made of Draft 3 through four staff members--a faculty member from each campus, a part-time faculty person, an administrator, and a classified staff member--during the period that the institutional research coordinator was reviewing it.

11. The institutional research coordinator's review of Draft 4 and the results of the initial pilot evoked some modifications and the utilization of vertical and

horizontal lines that were incorporated into the Draft 5 which was reviewed and approved by the Council.

12. Draft 5 was piloted by six employees of the South County Community College District: three of the original evaluators--two teaching faculty and a part-time faculty person--and three new evaluators--a classified staff person, an administrator from student service, and a full-time teaching faculty member. The range of time to complete the revised instrument was seventeen to twenty-five minutes.

13. Minor editing modifications were made and the lines were removed from the disk copy of Draft 6 and sent to Graphic Services Department for conversion onto a MacIntosh for final production of the form.

Layout and Content of the Needs Assessment Instrument

Information about the reason for the questionnaire, the estimated time period for completion, and where (not to whom) to send it when completed were provided at the beginning of the document. The remainder of the eight-page questionnaire was divided into five sections, A-E. Respondents were requested to write directly on the document in order to maximize the use of responder's time and the accuracy of the responses.

Section A covered ten items of the respondent's demographics. On the early drafts of the questionnaire, question 8 regarding age was prepared in multiple choice

form with ranges. At the end, the institutional research coordinator recommended that the respondent should write in the age in order to get more exacting final data in relationship to age.

Section B covered five items on Organizational Operating Environment. It was set up in a Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Agree) through 5 (Strongly Disagree). The respondent was instructed to circle the number representing the level of agreement.

Section C dealt with Potential Developmental Activities in four parts: topics, activities, motivators and workshop times. A four-choice scale was used with the following wording directly above the column: Definitely Yes, Probably Yes, Probably No, and Definitely No. The first part focused on topics and entailed forty-two items among the following five topic areas: (1) Meeting Changing Institutional Needs, (2) Development of Academic Knowledge and Skills, (3) Development of Technical Knowledge and Skills, (4) Improvement of Teaching and Student Services, (5) Development of the Whole Person. The second part on activities had eleven items. The third part had thirteen items, the last one being open ended. The fourth part had seven items relating to preferred workshop times, including two write-in questions regarding Staff Development Days.

Section D covered Personnel Achievements in Professional Development during the past two years. This section had two parts with a total of eighteen items. The

first part of the eight items requested a write-in response regarding participation in conferences, grants, and in-house staff development activities. The second part dealt with university courses relevant to community colleges and had ten items set up in a columnar format. The respondent was requested to check two things: (1) whether or not the respondent had taken a specific university course and (2) whether or not the respondent would take the course if (conveniently) offered.

Section E in two parts was for open-ended comments. The first part had eight lines available for the respondent to make comments and suggestions. The second part had five lines available for respondents to write in the topic or name of a workshop that they would be willing to provide. The name of the respondent was only necessary for those persons writing in a workshop topic or title.

The eight-page document ended with a thank you and another message on where to return the completed questionnaire. The text was printed back to back on four 8 1/2 by 11 sheets of light yellow paper that were stapled in the upper left corner.

Population Studied

Approximately 1,243 full-time and part-time faculty, administrators, and classified staff were hired during the spring quarter for courses being taught during the Monday through Saturday time period on the two campuses and at

off-site locations. It was determined that all 541 regular personnel--280 full-time faculty, 210 classified staff, and fifty-one administrators--would be surveyed. Since over 775 classes had been assigned to faculty on a part-time basis, special consideration needed to be given the hourly faculty. The institutional research coordinator suggested that a random sample be taken of the part-time group since they were not permanent employees and their number was large. The staff development coordinator and Council agreed that a twenty-five percent random sample be taken of the part-time faculty.

The spring, 1989 list of part-time faculty was finally obtained through the mailrooms of each college. Within the district, some 775 names, respective teaching areas, and full-time or hourly status were on the list for the spring, 1990 quarter: 528 names at Chabot College and 247 names at Las Positas College. Although Las Positas College's list included only the day, evening, and Saturday part-time faculty, the names of the full-time faculty who taught "overtime" or "overload" were on Chabot College's list. Seventy-seven full-time faculty names, or 13.8 percent, were removed from the list, leaving 445 part-time faculty. An estimated 702 part-time faculty were hired for spring quarter. In order to randomly select every fourth name, a starting place on each list was randomly made. From that point, every fourth name was selected to receive the needs assessment questionnaire.

Data Collection

Each questionnaire was individually coded, using 1000 numbers for faculty, 2000 numbers for classified staff, and 3000 numbers for administrators. Reference worksheets were prepared with the code number assigned to an individual or area. The coding helped to monitor and control the two ways that the questionnaire were distributed to faculty, classified staff, and administrators.

The organizational operation between Chabot College with 15,396 enrollments and Las Positas College with 5,122 enrollments differs. The older, parent campus is divided into the Office of Instruction and Student Personnel Services. There are eleven divisions that incorporate the departments of the disciplines, integrating career education and general education courses within each department. At the newly evolving Las Positas College, the faculty, administrators, and some classified staff have a mandatory meeting each month.

A pilot test of a method to distribute and get a high completion rate was completed at Las Positas. Arrangements had been made with the Dean of the evolving college to allow thirty minutes of the last meeting of winter quarter for personnel to complete the questionnaire. The timing of the meeting was significant in that it was the last meeting chaired by the Dean before the new president started in April.

At the allotted time, the Dean of Las Positas College introduced the significance of the event, and the chairs of the three staff development committees handed out a copy of the questionnaire to each person within their administrator, faculty, or classified staff segment. Confidentiality was maintained in this process because numbers were not matched with the names of the personnel in attendance. The chairs used a mailroom routing form to take roll of those persons present from their segment. Upon completion, questionnaires were placed in a plastic box carried around the room by the staff development coordinator. The names of the two faculty who wanted more time to complete the form were recorded on the Reference Worksheets. The rest of the code numbers for questionnaires completed were blocked off. Names of regular and contract personnel who were not in attendance were inserted with code numbers. They were sent a memorandum from the chair of the Staff Development Council on the importance of their completing the survey instrument.

When Las Positas College's completion results of ninety percent of the full-time faculty and of eight-five percent of the administrators were reported to the Council, the members from Chabot College determined that they wanted to parallel the process in a effort to "compete" for similar success. Since the once-a-quarter meeting with the chancellor in April at College Hour was not mandatory, it was decided to process the questionnaires in area

groupings as much as possible during May, the middle month of the quarter. Since the faculty met monthly in a division meeting, the division chairs were contacted to make arrangements for distributing and completing the survey.

Chabot Full-time Faculty. The staff development coordinator prepared the coding of the instruments on the Reference Worksheets for the instructional divisions by number of persons, based upon the routing sheets provided by each division chair. The questionnaires and instructions were given to each division's Faculty Development Committee representative. A coded questionnaire was always included for the division chair, a couple of classified and some part-time faculty. The procedures, used by the chairs at Las Positas, were followed.

Chabot Classified Staff. A current list of the classified staff of Chabot was available through the mailroom and served as a master list for this more complex portion of data collection. Four members of the classified staff served as monitors of the needs assessment in four major areas: Maintenance and Operations, Business Services, Admission and Records, and the Office of Instruction and adjacent services in the same building. The staff development coordinator coded the questionnaires and forwarded them, along with a numbered Reference Worksheet. Each of the four staff assigned names to the numbers, distributed, collected the completed

questionnaires, and forwarded the packet to the staff development coordinator. For other areas, coded questionnaires and a memorandum from the Council's chair and Classified Staff Committee's chair were sent through campus mail to the remaining classified staff for completion. A follow-up memo was sent two weeks after the distribution.

Chabot and District Administrators. The staff development coordinator coded the questionnaires and recorded names and numbers on the Reference Worksheet. The chair of the Administrative Staff Development Committee distributed the questionnaires in person on two afternoons. A followup reminder was sent two weeks after the district.

Chabot and Las Positas On-site and Off-site Part-time Faculty. The mailroom lists were used in place of the Reference Worksheets. The coded number was written next to the faculty members name. A memorandum from the Staff Development Council's chair and the coordinator accompanied the instrument and a return envelope. A follow up reminder, along with a second questionnaire and a return envelope, was sent two weeks after the original mailing.

Data Analysis

The institutional research coordinator provided the staff development coordinator a choice of two options for getting the data entered to be run on the district's DEC mainframe through the Scientific Package for Social

Sciences (SPSS). The first option was to use a DEC terminal, which was comparatively accessible once a security password had been assigned. This option involved using an older software wherein all the responses converted to numbers would be input in string form; one error would basically mean re-entering the respondent's file. The second option involved his customizing Filemaker software on a MacIntosh to accommodate the sections, items, and types of reply of the questionnaire. Even though MacIntosh computers were difficult to access, arrangements were made and the Filemaker program was used.

When the data from each questionnaire had been keyed into the Filemaker computer program and checked, the sequential document number of the program was recorded on the top of the questionnaire. This procedure allowed more than one person to enter the data at different times.

Information from 579 questionnaires were entered on a high density disk. Before loading the data into the DEC, the institutional research coordinator reviewed the files and determined that nineteen of them had inconsistencies with the number responses. The report by sequential document number allowed a review of the questionnaires and corrections to the files. The data were then loaded into the DEC mainframe and processed through SPSS. The information was presented on the computer printout by frequency and percentages of responses of the district's

personnel by the three segments: administration, faculty, and classified staff.

Summary

The methodology and procedures used in the investigation of staff development needs within a community college district have been presented. The design of the study has been described and the research questions reiterated. The procedures for the development of the needs assessment instrument and the content of the questionnaire have been delineated. Factors involved in determining the population of the study were provided. The methodology and procedures for data collection from the different populations were explained. Lastly, the methodology for inputting the information for analysis was described.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Chapter 4 has four sections: the respondent return rate, a review of the research questions, the results from the five parts of the questionnaire, and a summary. The first section describes the response rate of the questionnaire. Section two reviews the research questions. The third section presents the results. A summary is provided in section four.

Due to the nature of district, college, and mailroom listings of personnel, the data are segmented among the following four groups: administrators, full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and classified staff. The rationale for this segmentation follows. Only one of the fifty-two administrators was part-time. The personnel lists in the mailrooms follow the name listing pattern of the district's catalog--i.e., regular and contract part-time and full-time classified staff are listed in the catalog. Only the full-time faculty names are listed in the catalog. As a result, it was not possible to separate the full-time from the part-time day and night classified staff. In addition, the faculty on sabbatical or leave were removed; temporary replacements were combined with part-time faculty.

Rate of Return

The needs assessment questionnaire was sent to 708 full-time and part-time personnel of the South County Community College District. From the number distributed, 579 completed questionnaires were returned. The number of questionnaires distributed to administrators, faculty, and classified staff is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Questionnaire Return By Segment

Segment	Questionnaires Sent	Returned	Percentage of Return
Administration	50	48	96.0
Classified Staff	250	201	80.0
Full-time Faculty	269	214	80.0
Part-time Faculty (25% & Temporary)	176	112	64.0
Response Missing		2	
Total	745	577	77.5

Excluding the newly hired President and the one-year Chancellor of the district/Acting President of Chabot College, ninety-six percent of the administration responded. Eighty percent of both the day and evening contract classified staff and the full-time faculty completed and returned their questionnaires. Sixty-four percent of the part-time faculty sample responded. As may have been predicted by the distribution and collection

method, the full-time faculty who responded during meetings had a higher return rate (80%) compared to the return rate (64%) of the part-time faculty who responded from questionnaires forwarded to them through their mailboxes.

Research Questions

The research questions that were used to examine the problem of the study involved:

1. What information and skills through various activities are needed (and wanted) by faculty and staff to update/upgrade dissemination of information and interfacing of communications in order to meet the missions of the colleges among the multicultural segments?

2. What incentives are needed (and wanted) by faculty and staff to update/upgrade dissemination of information and interfacing of communications in order to meet the missions of the colleges among the multicultural segments?

3. What type of organizational operating climate does the faculty and staff perceive in relationship to support of staff development?

Questionnaire Analysis

Section A: Demographics

Section A of the needs assessment survey form contained ten items relating to the employment classifications and demographics of the respondents.

Table 2 presents the primary worksite of the respondents from Section A, Item 1.

Table 2

Respondent's Primary Worksite

Primary Worksite	Number	Percentage
Chabot College	410	71
Las Positas College	130	23
Off-site campus assignment	15	2
District	22	4
Total	577	100

The percentage response rate of seventy-one percent from Chabot College personnel and twenty-three percent response rate from Las Positas College personnel correlate within two percent of the district's personnel figures for the 1989-90 school year. That two percent difference is reflected in the two percent response from off-site respondents who have been working through administrators of one college or the other. Precise tracking is made more complicated during the transition from a one-college district to a two-college district since Las Positas College applied for its separate accreditation in autumn, 1989. A reorganization that includes new separate district positions has been evolving during 1990.

The types of positions held by the respondents, Section A, Item 2, is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Respondent's Type of Position

Type of Position	Number	Percentage
Full-time Position	425	74
Part-time Position	140	24
Temporary Position	12	2
Total	577	100

Seventy-four percent of the respondents to the needs assessment were full-time, while twenty-four percent were part-time. All but one administrator has a full-time position. The majority of the classified staff are full-time. Most of the part-time respondents are faculty who were solicited to complete the needs assessment through a twenty-five percent sample.

Table 4 shows number and percentage of respondents who work primarily during the day or primarily during the evening from Section A, Item 3.

Table 4

Respondent's Primary Day or Evening Assignment

Day or Evening/Night Assignment	Number	Percentage
Primarily Day Assignment	440	76.3
Primarily Evening/Night Assignment	134	23.2
Missing Responses	3	.5
Total	577	100.0

Approximately seventy-six percent of the respondents had primarily day assignments. Approximately twenty-three percent had primarily evening/night assignments.

Subdivision classifications of the three main segments of personnel--faculty, classified staff, and management--from Section A, Item 4 are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Respondent's Classification of Position

Position Classification	Number	Percentage
Faculty: Counselors	50	8.7
Faculty: Coordinators	49	8.5
Faculty: Other	227	39.3
Classified: Instructional Assistants	30	5.2
Classified: Other	157	27.2
Classified: Supervisors	14	2.4
Management: Division Chairs, Directors	17	2.9
Management: Other	31	5.5
Missing Responses	2	.3
Total	577	100.0

Historically, the faculty within the district have been classified as counseling faculty or teaching faculty. In addition, various faculty from both classifications have coordinating responsibilities. Faculty in each of these groups may have different staff development perspectives based on responsibilities.

The components of the classified staff is more complicated. Instructional assistants work in conjunction

with faculty in learning centers. The classification of "other" represents staff with diversified activities relating to such areas as Maintenance and Operations, Admission and Records, and office support. First-line supervisors are considered classified staff.

For the most part, the first-line supervisors of faculty are either division chairs or directors. The "other" management levels include a range from assistant deans through top-level administrators.

Years of service in the South County Community College District from Section A, Item 5 are detailed in Table 6.

Table 6

Respondent's Years of Service in District

Years of Service in District	Number	Percentage
0 - 1	86	14.9
2 - 3	76	13.2
4 - 5	70	12.1
6 - 10	98	17.0
11 - 15	94	16.3
16 - 20	50	8.7
21 - 25	65	11.3
26 or more	26	4.5
Missing Responses	12	2.0
Total	577	100.0

The district has been providing classes since 1961. The range of personnel service is from less than one year to more than twenty-six years. Approximately forty-three percent of the personnel have worked for the district

eleven or more years, and fifty-seven percent have been employed by the district ten or fewer years. Of the fifty-seven percent of personnel, forty percent have been hired during the past five years.

The frequency of responses from all areas within the district for Section A, Item 6 is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Respondents by Area of Assignment

Area of Assignment	Number	Percentage
Admissions and Records	22	3.8
Administrative Services	4	.7
Bookstore	9	1.5
Business Division	48	8.3
Business Services	17	2.9
Counseling and Guidance	37	6.4
EOPS (Equal Opportunities Program Services)	10	1.7
Health Science Division	27	4.8
Humanities Division	45	7.8
Athletics	5	.8
Language Arts Division	56	9.7
LRC (Learning Resource Center)	23	4.0
Maintenance and Operations	56	9.7
Management Information Systems	7	1.2
Office of Instruction	19	3.3
Personnel Services	1	.2
Physical Education Division	23	4.0
Safety and Security	3	.6
Science/Mathematics Division	62	10.7
Social Science Division	39	6.7
Special Student Services	11	1.9
Student Alumni Services	1	.2
Technology/Engineering Division	28	4.9
Other	23	4.0
Missing Responses	1	.2
Total	577	100.0

As Table 7 indicates, personnel from every discipline and area within the district participated in the needs assessment. The numbers of responses from each area correlated with the numbers of persons employed full-time and part-time in each area.

The frequency and percentage of male and female respondents from Section A, Item 7 is shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Respondent's Sex

Respondent's Sex	Number	Percentage
Female	284	49.2
Male	287	49.8
Missing Response	6	1.0
Total	577	100.0

There is an even balance between the female and male respondents at forty-nine percent. Six respondents indicated that the question was N/A (non applicable).

Section A, Item 8 requested that respondents write in their age. Although the data provided the number of respondents for each year, the data of Table 9 reflect the ages in five-year ranges for brevity.

The range of ages was twenty-one to sixty-nine. Twenty-seven percent of the personnel who completed this item are under forty, and over seventy-three percent are over forty. Three-fifths of the respondents are in the age

range of thirty-six to fifty-five years. The highest age range was 41-45 with 20.5 percent of the respondents. The median age and the mean age are forty-five years.

Table 9

Respondent's Age

Respondent's Age	Frequency	Percentage
21 - 25	11	1.9
26 - 30	32	5.5
31 - 35	36	6.2
36 - 40	78	13.5
41 - 45	118	20.5
46 - 50	82	14.2
51 - 55	69	12.1
56 - 60	55	9.5
61 - 65	20	3.5
66 and Over	2	.3
Missing Responses	74	12.8
Total	577	100.0

Seventy-four respondents, or almost thirteen percent, did not write in their age because they either felt the request was inappropriate or did not wish others to know. Omission of age in Item 8 was more prevalent among those respondents who answered the questionnaire in a group setting.

The highest level of education was determined through earned certificates, degrees, or diplomas at public or private institutions. This information from Section A, Item 9 is shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Respondent's Highest Certificate or Degree Earned

Highest Certificate or Degree Earned	Frequency	Percentage
Certificate Relevant to Job	8	1.4
High School Diploma	86	15.0
Associate Degree	63	11.0
Bachelor's Degree	69	12.0
Master's Degree	279	48.3
Doctorate	62	10.7
None of the Choices	5	.8
Missing Responses	5	.8
Total	577	100.0

Eighty-four percent of the personnel have a college degree. Sixty-four percent of the respondents, as shown in Table 5, were full-time/part-time faculty and administration. Table 10 shows fifteen percent of the respondents have a high school diploma as their highest degree. Eleven percent have earned an associate degree from a community college. Twelve percent have earned a bachelor degree. Forty-eight percent of the personnel have a master's degree, and 10.7 percent have a doctorate degree.

Section A, Item 10 requested information about the nature of prior employment. The results are presented in Table 11.

Thirty-nine percent of the district's personnel, or 223 respondents, came from non-educational institutions. One-third of the personnel had come from a postsecondary

Table 11

Respondent's Prior Place of Employment

Prior Place of Employment	Frequency	Percentage
High School, Junior High or Middle School	86	14.9
Different Community College in Full-time Status	41	7.1
Chabot or Las Positas College, or Different Community College in Part-time Status	87	15.1
Four-year University	65	11.3
Private or Public Non-educational Institution	223	38.6
High School or College Student	22	3.8
Missing Responses	53	9.2
Total	577	100.0

educational institution where they had worked in either full-time or part-time status. Fifteen percent had been previously employed in a secondary school. Fifty-three respondents, or 9.2 percent, did not complete the item.

Section B: Organizational Operating Environment

Section B had five items regarding the tone of the environment that promoted or discouraged development of personnel. Each item allowed respondents to express how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the statement. The frequency and percentage of each segment of responders--administration, faculty, and classified staff--are indicated, along with the number of responders for the item.

Table 12 shows the results from Item 1 of Section B on the perception of anticipated support for development of a community college's organizational operating environment.

> ITEM 1: The organization of a community college should promote an environment that encourages and facilitates the development and continuous learning of its employees as a priority in its operation in order to meet successfully its mission, goals, and objectives.

Table 12

Results of Perceptions Regarding the Importance of Organizational Promotion of Staff Development in Meeting Community College Missions and Goals

Segment	Strongly Agree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
Administration: N=48					
Frequency	40	6	1		1
Percentage	83.3	12.5	2.1		2.1
Faculty: N=324					
Frequency	220	81	19		4
Percentage	67.9	25.0	5.9		1.2
Classified Staff: N=199					
Frequency	142	32	23	1	1
Percentage	71.4	16.0	11.6	.5	.5
Missing Responses: N=6					
Percentage			1.0		
Total N=571					
Frequency	402	119	43	1	6
Percentage	70.4	20.8	7.5	.2	1.1

Ninety-one percent of the district's personnel either agreed or strongly agreed that the organization provide an environment that encouraged continuous learning of its

employees. Within the segments, administrators (95.8%) seemed to have believed that most strongly, and the faculty (92.9%) next most strongly. The classified staff agreed at 87.4 percent.

The perception of the organization's support for continuous professional growth is detailed in Table 13 from Section B, Item 2.

> ITEM 2: The organization of the college provides an operating environment that encourages and facilitates the professional growth and continuous learning of its employees.

Table 13

Results of Perceptions of the Degree that the College Provides a Supporting Environment for Personnel

Segment	Strongly Agree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
Administration: N=48					
Frequency	12	11	18	4	3
Percentage	25.0	22.9	37.5	8.3	6.3
Faculty: N=317					
Frequency	65	69	97	59	27
Percentage	20.5	21.8	30.6	18.6	8.5
Classified Staff: N=197					
Frequency	45	44	62	28	18
Percentage	22.8	22.4	31.5	14.2	9.1
Missing Responses: N=15					
Percentage			2.7		
Total N=562					
Frequency	122	124	177	91	48
Percentage	21.7	22	31.5	16.2	8.6

Of the 577 respondents, 43.7 percent, or 246 employees, agreed or strongly agreed that the institution encouraged professional growth and continuous learning of its faculty and staff. Of the remaining 316 respondents, one-third took a neutral position by neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement. One-fourth, or 139 persons, either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the environment encouraged professional growth within its operation. The forty-eight administrators agreed with this statement about four percent more than the faculty with a 47.9 response. More administrators took a neutral position than the other two segments. Forty-five percent of the classified staff agreed that the organization facilitated continuous learning, while only forty-two percent of the faculty agreed.

Table 14 presents the employees' perceptions on the organization's involving individuals in decision-making that directly affects their jobs. These results are from Section B, Item 3.

Fewer than half of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the organization facilitates input and participation in problem solving. Fifty-eight percent of the administration agreed or strongly agreed. Approximately, fifty percent of the faculty agreed or disagreed. About two-fifths of the classified agreed or disagreed. The neutral response was almost one-third for each segment.

ITEM 3: The organization of the college encourages and facilitates personnel to express concerns, input potential solutions, and to discuss matters that affect either their particular job tasks or their job within the college.

Table 14

Results of Perceptions of the Degree that the College Encourages Personnel to Participate in Matters that Directly Affect their Jobs

Segment	Strongly Agree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
Administration: N=48					
Frequency	14	14	14	2	4
Percentage	29.2	29.2	29.2	4.1	8.3
Faculty: N=319					
Frequency	67	95	91	46	20
Percentage	21.0	29.8	28.5	14.4	6.3
Classified Staff: N=197					
Frequency	42	36	71	32	16
Percentage	21.4	18.3	36.0	16.2	8.1
Missing Responses: N=13					
Percentage			2.3		
Total N=564					
Frequency	123	145	176	80	40
Percentage	21.9	25.7	31.2	14.2	7.0

Table 15 details the results from Item 4 of Section B regarding the responsiveness and feedback from administrators on decisions affecting jobs.

Thirty-eight percent of the personnel perceived the organization as being responsive and providing timely feedback on decisions that affect individual job tasks. Thirty-eight percent of the administrators took a neutral

ITEM 4: The organization of the college provides appropriate responsive, and timely feedback on decisions made that affect individual job tasks.

Table 15

Results of Perceptions of the Degree that the Organization Provides Timely Feedback

Segment	Strongly Agree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
Administration: N=48					
Frequency	11	8	18	7	4
Percentage	22.9	16.7	37.5	14.6	8.3
Faculty: N=319					
Frequency	57	70	109	54	29
Percentage	17.9	21.9	34.2	16.9	9.1
Classified Staff: N=196					
Frequency	38	30	64	41	23
Percentage	19.4	15.3	32.7	20.9	11.7
Missing Responses: N=14					
Percentage			2.4		
Total N=563					
Frequency	106	108	191	102	56
Percentage	18.8	19.2	33.9	18.1	10.0

position, while one-third the faculty and classified selected that neutral response. Twenty-eight percent of the employees perceived the organization as not being responsive by providing timely feedback on matters relating to a person's job.

Table 16 presents the data reflecting the perceptions of personnel on organizational values related to teamwork from Section B, Item 5.

ITEM 5: The organization of the college supports teamwork, collegial sharing, cooperation, and team-building.

Table 16

Results of Perceptions of the Degree that the Organization Supports Teamwork

Segment	Strongly Agree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
Administration: N=48					
Frequency	10	20	14	2	2
Percentage	20.8	41.6	29.2	4.2	4.2
Faculty: N=315					
Frequency	52	73	93	63	34
Percentage	16.5	23.2	29.5	20.0	10.8
Classified Staff: N=197					
Frequency	42	32	61	39	23
Percentage	21.3	16.2	31.0	19.8	11.7
Missing Responses: N=17					
Percentage			3.0		
Total N=560					
Frequency	104	125	168	104	59
Percentage	18.6	22.3	30.0	18.6	10.5

Forty-one percent of the personnel perceived teamwork, collegial sharing, cooperation, and team-building as organizational priorities. Sixty-two percent, or more than three-fifths, of the administration agreed. Two-fifths of the faculty agreed; less than two-fifths of the classified staff agreed. Whereas only eight percent of the administrators disagreed, approximately thirty percent of the faculty and classified staff disagreed.

Section C: Potential Developmental Activities

Section C had six areas used to investigate potential developmental activities. There are fifty-three items, 6 - 59. The respondents had four options for expressing their views on the value attending a workshop or activity on a topic for their staff development needs: Definitely Yes, Probably Yes, Probably No, and Definitely No.

The results for Items 6 - 16 of the first area address the issues of Meeting Changing Institutional Needs. The results of this area, along with the fourth area on motivation, will be segmented into the frequency and percentage responses from administrators, faculty, and classified staff. The responses to these items in Section C serve to interact with the Section B, Items 1-5 as well as interface with the responses to motivation. The inter-connections develop reliability and validity of the needs assessment instrument. The results for the other four areas, Developmental Academic Knowledge and Skills, Development of Technical Knowledge and Skills, Improvement of Teaching and Student Services, Development of the Whole Person, and Workshop Times will be reported in the aggregate.

Section C provides numerous topics for faculty and staff to express their interest in participating in a workshop on that topic. Table 17 contains the data from Item 6 on employees' interest in learning ways to make meetings more productive.

ITEM 6: Strategies to make meetings more effective and productive.

Table 17

Results on the Probability of Participation in Workshops on Strategies for Effective Meetings

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration: N=48				
Frequency	18	18	12	
Percentage	37.5	37.5	25.0	
Faculty: N=324				
Frequency	53	118	114	39
Percentage	16.4	36.4	35.2	12.0
Classified Staff: N=198				
Frequency	50	72	60	16
Percentage	25.3	36.4	30.3	8.0
Missing Responses: N=7				
Percentage			1.2	
Total N=570				
Frequency	121	208	186	55
Percentage	21.2	36.5	32.6	9.7

Approximately, fifty-eight percent of the respondents were interested in attending a workshop on strategies to make meetings more effective and productive. Administrators were most interested (75%) in gaining new strategies. Classified staff (61.7%) had the second highest interest in such workshops, while the faculty (52.8) held the least interest in this topic.

Respondents' interest in strategies for coping with stress from Section C, Item 7 are shown in Table 18.

ITEM 7: Strategies for stress management, cooperation, and team-building.

Table 18

Results of Interest in Participation in Workshops on Dealing with Stress and Team-building

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration: N=48				
Frequency	16	24	7	1
Percentage	33.3	50.0	14.6	2.1
Faculty: N=323				
Frequency	58	124	106	35
Percentage	18.0	38.4	32.8	10.8
Classified Staff: N=200				
Frequency	73	80	34	13
Percentage	36.5	40.0	17.0	6.5
Missing Responses: N=6				
Percentage			1.0	
Total N=571				
Frequency	147	228	147	49
Percentage	25.7	40.0	25.7	8.6

Approximately, sixty-six percent of the respondents, or 375 employees, indicated that they were interested in participating in a workshop on strategies for stress management, cooperation, and teambuilding. Eighty-three percent of the administrators were interested in such workshops. Seventy-six percent of the classified staff and fifty-six percent of the faculty were interested in this kind of workshop.

The data of Table 19 describes the respondents' interest in developing strategies for working with different kinds of people from Section C, Item 8.

ITEM 8: Strategies for problem solving and working with different kinds of people.

Table 19

Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Solving Problems and Working with People

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration:				
N=46				
Frequency	19	20	5	2
Percentage	41.3	43.5	10.9	4.3
Faculty:				
N=324				
Frequency	69	143	87	25
Percentage	21.3	44.1	26.9	7.7
Classified Staff:				
N=199				
Frequency	81	79	28	11
Percentage	40.7	39.7	14.1	5.5
Missing Responses:				
N=8				
Percentage			1.4	
Total				
N=569				
Frequency	169	242	120	38
Percentage	29.7	42.5	21.1	6.7

Seventy-two percent of the respondents indicated that they would attend a workshop on strategies for problem solving and working with different kinds of people. The administrators expressed most interest (84.8%); the classified staff was close to that percentage (80.4%). The faculty responded with an interest factor of 65.4 percent.

Table 20 describes the respondent's interest in meeting about goals, priorities, and problems of work areas from Section C, Item 9.

ITEM 9: Determination of division or area goals, priorities, problems.

Table 20

Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Setting Division/Area Goals and Priorities

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration: N=47				
Frequency	20	15	10	2
Percentage	42.6	31.9	21.3	4.3
Faculty: N=321				
Frequency	98	134	63	26
Percentage	31.4	41.7	19.6	8.1
Classified Staff: N=197				
Frequency	62	78	43	14
Percentage	31.5	39.6	21.8	7.1
Missing Responses: N=12				
Percentage			2.1	
Total N=565				
Frequency	180	227	116	42
Percentage	31.9	40.2	20.5	7.4

Seventy-two percent of the respondents expressed positive interest in participating in workshops that deal with division or area goals, priorities, and problems. Over seventy percent of all three segments wanted such workshops.

The results shown in Table 21 from Section C, Item 10 reflect respondent's interest in communicating skills.

ITEM 10: Techniques to enhance leadership and communication skills.

Table 21

Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Leadership and Communication Techniques

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration: N=48				
Frequency	21	22	3	2
Percentage	43.8	45.8	6.3	4.2
Faculty: N=324				
Frequency	72	134	93	25
Percentage	22.2	41.4	28.7	7.7
Classified Staff: N=201				
Frequency	84	71	34	12
Percentage	41.8	35.3	16.9	6.0
Missing Responses: N=4				
Percentage			.7	
Total N=573				
Frequency	177	227	130	39
Percentage	30.9	39.6	22.7	6.8

Approximately seventy percent of the respondents would participate in a workshop about techniques to enhance leadership and communication skills. Ninety percent of the administrators affirmatively responded. Seventy-seven of the classified staff and 63.6 percent of the faculty also gave a "yes" response.

The data from Section C, Item 11 regarding attending workshops on improving employee relations with updating on managerial practices is shown in Table 22.

ITEM 11: Employee relations and new managerial theories and practices.

Table 22

Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Employee Relations and Managerial Practices

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration: N=47				
Frequency	12	24	10	1
Percentage	25.5	51.1	21.3	2.1
Faculty: N=321				
Frequency	37	103	133	48
Percentage	11.5	32.1	41.4	15.0
Classified Staff: N=198				
Frequency	56	73	56	13
Percentage	28.3	36.9	28.3	6.6
Missing Responses: N=11				
Percentage			1.9	
Total N=566				
Frequency	105	200	199	62
Percentage	18.6	35.3	35.2	10.9

Fifty-four percent of the respondents were interested in getting more information on employee relations connected with new managerial theories and practices. Almost seventy-seven percent of the administrators indicated "yes." The classified staff had 65.2 percent "yes" replies. The faculty showed less interest with a 43.6 percent "yes" reply.

Table 23 presents the data from Section C, Item 12 regarding interest in workshops on hiring practices.

ITEM 12: Hiring practices and affirmative action issues: applying policies and regulations.

Table 23

Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Hiring Practices and Affirmative Action

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration:				
N=47				
Frequency	18	15	14	
Percentage	38.3	31.9	29.8	
Faculty:				
N=324				
Frequency	66	107	105	46
Percentage	20.4	33.0	32.4	14.2
Classified Staff:				
N=197				
Frequency	41	58	70	28
Percentage	20.8	29.5	35.5	14.2
Missing Responses:				
N=9				
Percentage			1.6	
Total				
N=568				
Frequency	125	180	189	74
Percentage	22.0	31.7	33.3	13.0

Almost fifty-four percent of the respondents indicated that they would attend a workshop on hiring practices and affirmative action issues. Seventy percent of the administrators gave a "yes" response. Slightly more than half of the faculty and classified staff replied positively to this item.

The results from Section C, Item 13 about workshops on strategies on internationalizing and multiculturalizing the curriculum are shown in Table 24.

ITEM 13: Strategies to internationalize and multiculturalize the curriculum.

Table 24

Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Multiculturizing the Curriculum

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration: N=48				
Frequency	15	16	14	3
Percentage	31.2	33.3	29.2	6.3
Faculty: N=323				
Frequency	81	99	97	46
Percentage	25.1	30.7	30.0	14.2
Classified Staff: N=147				
Frequency	18	34	73	22
Percentage	12.2	23.1	49.7	15.0
Missing Responses: N=59				
Percentage			10.2	
Total N=518				
Frequency	114	149	184	71
Percentage	22.0	28.8	35.5	13.7

Fifty-one percent of the respondents affirmatively answered Item 13 on developing strategies to internationalize and multiculturize the curriculum. Sixty-five percent of the administrators, fifty-six percent of the faculty, and thirty-five percent of the classified staff marked "yes." Ten percent of the total respondents did not mark an answer; this group was basically the classified staff who are in such areas as Maintenance and Operations and Business Services.

The data of Table 25 describes the respondent's interest in exploring strategies to improve working situations within a multicultural population from Section C, Item 14.

ITEM 14: Strategies for working with and within a multicultural population.

Table 25

Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Ways to Deal with a Multicultural Population

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration:				
N=48				
Frequency	16	24	8	
Percentage	33.3	50.0	16.7	
Faculty:				
N=323				
Frequency	101	130	61	31
Percentage	31.3	40.2	18.9	9.6
Classified Staff:				
N=196				
Frequency	44	73	57	22
Percentage	22.5	37.2	29.1	11.2
Missing Responses:				
N=10				
Percentage			1.7	
Total				
N=567				
Frequency	161	227	126	53
Percentage	28.4	40.0	22.2	9.4

Sixty-eight of the respondents replied that they would participate in a workshop on strategies for working with and within a multicultural population. Eighty-three percent of the administrators, seventy-two percent of the faculty, and sixty percent of the classified checked "yes."

Respondent's interest in techniques to improve student retention from Section C, Item 15 are shown in Table 26.

ITEM 15: Techniques for improving the retention of transfer and vocational students.

Table 26

Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Techniques for Improving Student Retention

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration: N=48				
Frequency	21	12	13	2
Percentage	43.8	25.0	27.1	4.2
Faculty: N=321				
Frequency	91	123	80	27
Percentage	28.4	38.3	24.9	8.4
Classified Staff: N=152				
Frequency	23	31	65	33
Percentage	15.1	20.4	42.8	21.7
Missing Responses: N=56				
Percentage			9.7	
Total N=521				
Frequency	135	166	158	62
Percentage	25.9	31.9	30.3	11.9

Fifty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that they would participate in workshops about techniques for improving the retention of transfer and vocational students. Two-thirds of the faculty and administration were interested in such workshops. In addition, one-third of the classified staff replied affirmatively.

Table 27 shows the data from Section C, Item 16 dealing with peer review programs at other colleges.

ITEM 16: Peer review programs that have worked at other California community colleges.

Table 27

Results of Interest in Participating in Workshops on Peer Review Programs from Other Community Colleges

Segment	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
Administration: N=47				
Frequency	19	20	6	2
Percentage	40.4	42.6	12.8	4.3
Faculty: N=324				
Frequency	70	135	97	22
Percentage	21.6	41.7	29.9	6.8
Classified Staff: N=193				
Frequency	37	73	65	18
Percentage	19.2	37.8	33.7	9.3
Missing Responses: N=13				
Percentage				
Total N=564				
Frequency	126	228	168	42
Percentage	22.3	40.4	29.8	7.5

Sixty-three percent of the respondents replied that they would participate in workshops on the topic of peer review programs that have worked at other community colleges. General interest is shown in descending order: administrators, 83 percent; faculty, 63.3 percent; classified staff, 57 percent.

Section C: Development of Academic Knowledge & Skills

The data of this portion of the needs assessment will be reported in the aggregate, since notification of the workshops will include invitations to all segments of personnel. Table 28 provides the results from Section C, Item 17 regarding the sharing of findings from conferences, Sabbaticals, and Leaves of Absence.

ITEM 17: Presentations of experiences and findings from employees returning from a conference, Sabbatical, or Leave of Absence.

Table 28

Aggregate Responses to Workshops on Reports of Employees Returning from a Conference, Sabbatical, or Leave of Absence

Item	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No	Missing
Frequency N=577	102	232	167	68	8
Percentages	17.7	40.2	28.9	11.8	1.4

Fifty-eight percent of the respondents, or 334 employees, replied "yes," and forty-one percent replied "no."

The interest in workshops to develop grant writing skills from Section C, Item 18 is shown in Table 29.

Forty percent of the respondents indicated "yes" to training for grant writing. Fifty-one percent indicated no interest, and nine percent did not respond.

ITEM 18: Training for grant writing to develop ideas into formal action.

Table 29

Aggregate Responses to Workshops on Grant Writing to Develop Ideas into Formal Action

	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No	Missing
Frequency N=577	86	147	203	90	51
Percentages	14.9	25.5	35.2	15.6	8.8

Table 30 shows the results from Section C, Item 19 on the interest in training to write for publication.

ITEM 19: Training on writing an article for publication or a textbook.

Table 30

Aggregate Responses to Workshops to Train on Writing for Publication

Item	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No	Missing
Frequency N=577	102	135	204	126	10
Percentages	17.7	23.4	35.4	21.8	1.7

Forty-one percent, or 237 respondents, replied "yes" to a workshop to train for writing for publication. Fifty-seven percent were not interested.

The results of Table 31 presents the interest in development in giving presentations at conferences.

ITEM 20: Techniques for preparing and delivering presentations at workshops and conferences.

Table 31

Aggregate Responses to Workshops on Developing Presentations for Workshops and Conferences

Item	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No	Missing
Frequency N=577	105	194	181	87	10
Percentages	18.2	33.6	31.4	15.1	1.7

Fifty-two percent, or 299 respondents, replied that they would participate in a workshop that would help them prepare for and deliver presentations at workshops and conferences. Even though many of the classified staff may not have been interested in such a workshop, they did reply to this item.

The results for Section C, Item 21 on sharing information of subject areas are shown in Table 32.

ITEM 21: Sharing new findings and thinking within and among subject areas.

Table 32

Aggregate Responses to Workshops on Sharing New Findings in Subject Areas

Item	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No	Missing
Frequency N=577	169	238	116	35	19
Percentages	29.3	41.2	20.1	6.1	3.3

Seventy-one percent, or 407 respondents, indicated that they would participate in a workshop to share new findings and thinking within and among subject areas.

The interest in learning the techniques to use the DIALOG system in the Learning Resource Center to explore topics of educational concern is presented in Table 33. These results are from Section C, Item 22.

> ITEM 22: Techniques of using the DIALOG educational literature research in the Chabot LRC to investigate studies on such topics as attrition in mathematics, coping with underprepared students.

Table 33

Aggregate Responses to Workshops to Learn DIALOG to Utilize Educational Literature Research

Item	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No	Missing
Frequency N=577	67	158	206	88	58
Percentages	11.6	27.4	35.7	15.3	10.0

Thirty-nine percent, or 225 respondents, replied that they would participate in a workshop to learn about DIALOG literature searches on various educational topics. The respondents who were interested were faculty and some administrators.

The data of Table 34 describes the respondent's willingness to attend luncheons or dinners with speakers on education or world issues.

ITEM 23: Lunch or Dinner Speaker Sessions on a monthly or quarterly basis on education or world issues.

Table 34

Aggregate Responses to Monthly or Quarterly Lunches or Dinners with Speakers on Education or World Issues

Item	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No	Missing
Frequency N=577	95	218	179	78	7
Percentages	16.5	37.8	31.0	13.5	1.2

Fifty-four percent, or 313 respondents, indicated interest in attending either lunches or dinners on a monthly or quarterly basis that featured speakers on educational or world issues. Ninety-five employees, or 16.5 percent, were particularly interested. Only 1.2 percent did not answer this item.

Section C: Development of Technical Knowledge and Skills

Eight items, 24 through 31, comprise this section on workshops that focus on the development of technical knowledge and skills. Although the detailed information distinguishing the answer from "definitely yes" and "probably yes" will be available for internal usage, Table 35 presents the frequencies and percentages for Yes, No, and Missing to summarize the data. The content of the statement to be responded to is situated at the left side of the table.

Table 35

Aggregate Responses to Workshops on the Development of Technical Knowledge and Skills

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
24. Computer technology applications that would facilitate operations in your computer area.	456	79.0	112	19.4	9	1.6
25. WordPerfect word processing	346	60.0	218	37.8	13	2.2
26. Conversion of word processing softwares from WordStar to WordPerfect	220	38.2	325	56.3	32	5.5
27. Word processing and other applications on the MAC	318	55.1	243	42.1	16	2.8
28. Desktop Publishing softwares	351	60.8	213	36.9	13	2.3
29. Managing your paper copy and computer files	335	58.1	230	39.8	12	2.1
30. Development of slides or transparencies	242	41.9	321	55.7	14	2.4
31. Development of videos or interactive video discs	296	51.3	269	46.6	12	2.1

This section dealing with technology held high interest to the respondents: six of the eight items received over fifty percent "yes" responses. Computer

technology applications for facilitating work received a significant seventy-nine percent response. The level of concern/interest in those applications may be partly due to the fact that the district started a conversion from WordStar on Televideo computers at Chabot College and from Wang minicomputers at Las Positas College to WordPerfect on IBM microcomputers. Even though some WordPerfect training was provided in autumn, 1989; the data of sixty percent "yes" responses on Item 25 shows that many personnel want more training on the new district standard of WordPerfect. Item 28 on Desktop Publishing received a 60.8 percent response rate. Gaining that computer skill rated equally as important as the learning of WordPerfect.

The data from item 27 shows that fifty-five percent, or 318 respondents, want workshops on word processing and other applications for MacIntosh microcomputers. Many of the respondents may prefer to learn Desktop Publishing concepts on the MacIntosh computer rather than on an IBM computer.

Respondents were also concerned about dealing with computer files and with video technology. Item 29--managing your paper copy and computer files--received a 58.1 percent "yes" response by 335 employees. The development of videos or interactive video discs, of item 31, had a 51.3 percent positive response.

Section C: Improvement of Teaching and Student Services

Table 36 shows Items 32 through 45 of Section C that focus on workshops to improve teaching and student services.

Table 36

Aggregate Responses to Workshops on the Improvement of Teaching and Student Services

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
32. Development of a quarter timeplan and a course syllabus	186	32.3	322	55.8	69	11.9
33. Methodologies on teaching a subject and on student learning	270	46.8	238	41.3	69	11.9
34. Techniques for preparing behavioral objectives for classroom activities	179	31.0	327	56.7	71	12.3
35. Strategies for increasing student motivation	328	56.9	12	31.5	67	11.6
36. Methodologies for developing critical thinking skills across the curriculum	281	48.7	228	39.5	68	11.8
37. Techniques for evaluating student writing of essays and papers across the curriculum	184	31.9	327	56.7	66	11.4
38. Strategies for promoting better study skills among students in a course	280	48.6	227	39.3	70	12.1

Table 36

(Cont.)

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
39. Techniques for Pronouncing Asian or Middle Eastern names of our multicultural students	246	42.6	311	53.9	20	3.5
40. Cultural differences of Asian and Middle Eastern countries that characterize our multicultural students	312	54.1	243	42.1	22	3.8
41. Methods for improving service to and working with culturally diverse people	358	62.1	193	33.4	26	4.5
42. Approaches to help students with limited English develop better oral or written communication skills	264	45.7	248	43.0	65	11.3
43. Techniques for recruiting vocational, technical and culturally diverse students	202	35.1	310	53.7	65	11.2
44. Techniques to improve your counseling or advising effectiveness	269	46.6	247	42.8	61	10.6
45. Strategies for recognizing learning disabilities for referral	316	54.8	240	41.6	21	3.6

Table 36

Aggregate Responses to Workshops on the Improvement of Teaching and Student Services (Cont.)

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
39. Techniques for Pronouncing Asian or Middle Eastern names of our multicultural students	246	42.6	311	53.9	20	3.5
40. Cultural differences of Asian and Middle Eastern countries that characterize our multicultural students	312	54.1	243	42.1	22	3.8
41. Methods for improving service to and working with culturally diverse people	358	62.1	193	33.4	26	4.5
42. Approaches to help students with limited English develop better oral or written communication skills	264	45.7	248	43.0	65	11.3
43. Techniques for recruiting vocational, technical and culturally diverse students	202	35.1	310	53.7	65	11.2
44. Techniques to improve your counseling or advising effectiveness	269	46.6	247	42.8	61	10.6
45. Strategies for recognizing learning disabilities for referral	316	54.8	240	41.6	21	3.6

The affirmative response range for the fourteen items in the table dealing with the improvment of teaching and student services was 179 through 358. Four items had more than fifty percent: item 35 - strategies for increasing student motivation, item 40 - cultural differences of Asian and Middle Eastern countries that characterize our students, item 41 - methods for improving service to and working with culturally diverse people, and item 45 - strategies for recognizing learning disabilities for referral.

Section C: Development of the Whole Person

The data for the three items, 46 through 48, in this section on the whole person are presented in Table 37.

Table 37

Aggregate Responses to Workshops on the Development of the Whole Person

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
46. Physical fitness, wellness, and balancing your life	356	61.7	216	37.4	5	.9
47. New findings and information about health care topics	335	58.1	235	40.7	7	1.2
48. Nutrition for a more productive and healthier life	326	56.5	245	42.5	6	1.0

The response rates were high in this section. All three items received more than fifty-five percent affirmative responses.

Section C: Interactive Staff Development Activities

This section shifted from subject-matter workshops to kinds of activities. The data for the eleven items, 49 through 59, are presented in Table 38.

Table 38

Aggregate Responses to Interactive Activities

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
49. Visitations with counterparts UC or CSU Hayward	383	66.4	187	32.4	7	1.2
50. Visitation programs with counterparts at community colleges to discuss common issues	419	72.6	149	25.8	9	1.6
51. Meetings with counterparts at Chabot or Las Positas to discuss common issues	422	73.1	143	73.1	12	24.8
52. Meetings with high school counselors and faculty to market programs and to recruit students	294	51.0	262	45.4	21	3.6
53. Visits to private and public organizations to observe and learn about jobs like yoursor for students you train	347	60.2	209	36.2	21	3.6

Table 38

(Cont.)

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
54. Business and industry in-service work programs during summer or school year	275	47.7	284	49.2	18	3.1
55. Observation of a selected colleague's class or job for ideas and techniques	355	61.5	206	35.7	16	2.8
56. Career counseling on jobs, certificates, and degrees within the district and other higher education settings	253	43.8	308	53.4	16	2.8
57. Staff Mentor Program: experienced employees work with new employees	336	58.2	215	37.3	26	4.5
58. Faculty Mentor Program: long-term faculty work with new full-time faculty	254	44.1	242	41.9	81	14.0
59. Faculty Mentor Program: long-term faculty work with part-time faculty	260	45.0	238	41.3	79	13.7

Almost three-fourths of the respondents replied with a "yes" to item 50 - Visitation programs with counterparts at other community colleges to discuss common issues and to item 51 - Meetings with counterparts at Chabot College or

Table 38

Aggregate Responses to Interactive Activities (Cont.)

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
54. Business and industry in-service work programs during summer or school year	275	47.7	284	49.2	18	3.1
55. Observation of a selected colleague's class or job for ideas and techniques	355	61.5	206	35.7	16	2.8
56. Career counseling on jobs, certificates, and degrees within the district and other higher education settings	253	43.8	308	53.4	16	2.8
57. Staff Mentor Program: experienced employees work with new employees	336	58.2	215	37.3	26	4.5
58. Faculty Mentor Program: long-term faculty work with new full-time faculty	254	44.1	242	41.9	81	14.0
59. Faculty Mentor Program: long-term faculty work with part-time faculty	260	45.0	238	41.3	79	13.7

Almost three-fourths of the respondents replied with a "yes" to item 50 - Visitation programs with counterparts at other community colleges to discuss common issues and to item 51 - Meetings with counterparts at Chabot College or

Las Positas College to discuss common issues. Two-thirds would participate in visits to UC (located sixteen miles away) or CSU, Hayward (located seven miles away). Sixty percent would participate in visits to private or public organizations. Fifty percent would meet with high school counselors and faculty. The missing responses to the last three items, 57 - 59, on mentoring deflect the positive percentages; the response is favorable to mentoring.

Section C: Motivations for Participating in Staff Development Activities

This section contained twelve items to rate and one open-ended item. These items dealt with motivations for participating in staff development activities. The data for the twelve items, 60 through 71, are presented in Table 39.

Two items received particularly high affirmative responses. Over three quarters (76.4%) of the respondents declared that more salary incentives for participation in staff development (item 60) would be a motivator. At closer inspection at this item's breakdown, 46.6 responded definitely yes, while 29.6 indicated probably yes. This item had only 2.8 percent of the respondents not answer, whereas the percent missing in this grouping ranged from 5 to 13 percent. Two-thirds, or 384 respondents, indicated their interest in a leave of absence to update skills relevant to their present position (item 70).

Table 39

Aggregate Response to Motivators for Participating in Staff Development Activities

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
60. More salary incentives for participation in staff development activities	441	76.4	120	20.8	16	2.8
61. Reassigned time for classroom-related research, for the development of extensive new materials, and for development of new teaching strategies	366	63.4	179	31.1	32	5.5
62. Stipends for development of new materials related to classroom-related research, such as student follow-up studies	296	51.3	204	35.4	77	13.3
63. Tuition support for faculty training into a new discipline to address changing student needs	293	50.8	205	35.5	79	13.7
64. Provision of a substitute or replacement when staff development activities are occurring	358	62.0	185	32.0	34	6.0
65. Stipends and tuition payment for taking Friday night/ Saturday courses to learn updating of softwares for job	340	58.9	208	36.1	29	5.0

Table 39

Aggregate Response to Motivators for Participating in Staff Development Activities (Cont.)

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
66. A Resource Center with resource files and materials, drop-in computer lab and computer assistance	354	61.4	194	33.6	29	5.0
67. Provision of a grant writer/facilitator to nurture ideas into formal action	284	50.1	257	44.5	31	5.4
68. Provision of additional funding for college personnel to attend conferences and/or make presentations	341	59.1	205	35.5	31	5.4
69. Allowance for scheduling classes on four weekdays to facilitate visits to local businesses or high schools on the 5th day	317	54.9	219	38.0	41	7.1
70. Leave of Absence to update skills relevant to your present job or in development of Contract Education	384	66.6	157	27.2	36	6.2
71. Access to UC Berkeley or CSU Hayward courses in Learning Theories, Curriculum Methodology, Organizational Management, and Assessments/Evaluations	301	52.2	236	40.9	40	6.9

Table 39

(Cont.)

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
66. A Resource Center with resource files and materials, drop-in computer lab and computer assistance	354	61.4	194	33.6	29	5.0
67. Provision of a grant writer/facilitator to nurture ideas into formal action	284	50.1	257	44.5	31	5.4
68. Provision of additional funding for college personnel to attend conferences and/or make presentations	341	59.1	205	35.5	31	5.4
69. Allowance for scheduling classes on four weekdays to facilitate visits to local businesses or high schools on the 5th day	317	54.9	219	38.0	41	7.1
70. Leave of Absence to update skills relevant to your present job or in development of Contract Education	384	66.6	157	27.2	36	6.2
71. Access to UC Berkeley or CSU Hayward courses in Learning Theories, Curriculum Methodology, Organizational Management, and Assessments/Evaluations	301	52.2	236	40.9	40	6.9

Each of the twelve items received fifty percent or more definitely or probably yes responses. In addition to items 60 and 70, three more items were given a yes response: items 61, 64, and 66. Reassigned time (item 61) received 63.4 percent, or 366 affirmative responses. Provision of a substitute in order to attend staff development activities (item 64) received 62 percent, or 358 yes responses. Item 66 - a Resource Center with materials and support - received 354, or 61.4 percent, yes responses.

Item 72 was open ended. Eight respondents wrote in; of these three listed additional items that would motivate them into participating in staff development activities. They are the following items.

1. Stipends for project development work in research and continuing education credit during summer months for part-time faculty.

2. Released time to attend lectures and classes (UCB, CSU, Dominican College, San Jose State) in topics relevant to courses taught or in the process of development.

3. Reassigned time for college-related research (similar to item 61 but not exclusively classroom-related).

Section C.: Workshop Times

The seven questions in this section regarding workshop times were corollary to the main research questions but important to the Staff Development Council for future

planning. The data for the responses on workshop times are presented in Table 40.

Table 40

Aggregate Responses to Workshop Times

Item	Definitely & Probably Yes F	Percent	Definitely & Probably No F	Percent	N=577 Missing F	Percent
73. College Hour	327	56.7	169	29.3	81	14.0
74. Lunch Hour	278	48.2	219	37.9	80	13.9
75. Saturdays	187	32.4	318	55.1	72	12.5
76. Friday Afternoons or afternoons as can be arranged	334	57.9	194	33.6	49	8.5
77. 5 to 6 p.m. (generally day employees) or 5:45 p.m. to 6:45 p.m.(part-time faculty or staff)	248	43.0	273	47.3	56	9.7
78. Non-instructional days between quarters or in the summer	264	45.8	266	46.1	47	8.1
79. Non-instructional days in early September before Orientation Week	286	49.6	244	42.3	47	8.1

College Hour, which is from 11 o'clock until noon on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and Friday afternoons were the two most favored times for staff development activities for over 300 respondents. Saturdays were the least favored time. Using non-instructional days in September before classes start received 286, or 49.6 percent, "yes" responses.

Section C: Options for Staff Development Days

The data for item 80 are shown in Table 41.

Item 80: The present (faculty) contract requires 176 days of service from faculty; the state (of California) requires 175 days. Replace classroom instruction with staff development on one day during the longest quarter of the year.

Table 41

Responses to Replacing an Instruction Day with a Staff Development Day

	Yes		No		N=577 Missing	
	F	Percent	F	Percent	F	Percent
Administration	31	65.0	17	35.0	0	0.0
Faculty	296	91.0	31	0.0	0	0.0
Classified Staff	9	4.0	0	0.0	193	96.0
Total	336	58.0	48	8.3	193	33.4

Fifty-eight percent, or 336 respondents, indicated that the extra day demanded by the district in excess of the 175 instructional days required by California's legislature be converted into a staff development day for all personnel. Thirty-three percent did not reply, perhaps, because the issue deals with the faculty's collective bargaining contract.

More than fifty percent of California's community colleges have negotiated Flex Days. Item 81 dealt with that issue through an open-ended question. The data are presented in Table 42.

ITEM 81: FLEX DAYS are service days that are used for staff development activities instead of instruction. Flex Days must be bargained and arranged with the Chancellor's Office. Over 50 percent of California Community Colleges have 2 to 15 Flex Days. Please indicate the number of Flex Days that you would like to be made available in the district.

Table 42

Number of Flex Days Wanted by Respondents

Number Days	N=577 Frequency	Percentage
No Answer	151	26.1
No Days	29	5.0
1 Day	16	2.7
2 Days	45	7.8
3 Days	52	9.0
4 Days	12	2.1
5 Days	65	11.3
6 Days	41	7.1
7 Days	17	2.9
8 Days	10	1.7
9 Days	9	1.6
10 Days	57	9.9
11 Days	1	.2
12 Days	14	2.4
13 Days	1	.2
14 Days	1	.2
15 Days	52	9.0
16 or More Days	4	.8
Total	577	100.0

One-fourth of the respondents did not reply to this question since it dealt primarily with the faculty's collective bargaining agreement. Since Chabot and Las Positas colleges are on the quarter system, it is reasonable that three days, or one day each quarter, attracted nine percent of the respondents. The other high responses were

in increments of five: 5 days had 65 respondents; 10 days had 57 respondents; 15 days had 52 respondents. The mean was 6.8 days, and the median was 5 days. A significant 68.8 percent, or 397 respondents, indicated that the institution should allow for staff development activities.

Section D: Personal Achievement in Professional Development

This section has eighteen items, 1 through 18. This section requested that the respondents write their answers to items 1 through 8 and check their responses for items 9 through 18. The data for item 1 is shown in Table 43.

ITEM 1: How many conferences, instructional workshops, or technical training workshops have you attended during the past two years in which you personally paid more than two-thirds the cost?

Table 43

Number of Conferences and Workshops that Respondents Paid More Than Two-thirds of the Cost During the Past Two Years

Number	N=577 Frequency	Percent
0	280	48.5
1	63	10.9
2	54	9.4
3	44	7.6
4	35	6.1
5	25	4.3
6	12	2.1
7 or more	27	4.7
Missing	37	6.4
Total	577	100.0

Nearly half of the respondents had not paid most of the cost of a conference attended. Approximately forty-five percent had paid more than two-thirds the cost for one to twenty off-site conferences. The range was zero to 20; the mean was 1.75.

The results of Section D, Item 2 regarding conference attendance paid by the institution is presented in Table 44.

> ITEM 2: How many conferences, instructional workshops or technical training workshops have you attended during the past two years in which the institution paid most of the cost?

Table 44

Number of Conferences and Workshops Attended in Past Two years that District Paid Most of the Cost

Number	N=577 Frequency	Percent
0	213	36.9
1	83	14.4
2	80	13.9
3	47	8.2
4	49	8.5
5	26	4.5
6	21	3.6
7	2	.3
8	10	1.7
9	1	.2
10	5	.9
11 - 20	6	1.0
Missing	34	5.9
Total	577	100.0

Approximately, one-third of the respondents, or 213 respondents, had not used district funds to attend an

external conference, instructional workshop, or a technical training workshop. When the zero response is added to the missing responses, 42.8 percent claim that they have not used district funds for such activities.

Conversely, the district had paid most of the costs for conference and workshop attendance for 310 employees. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents had attended one or two activities. The mean was 2; the median was 1.

Table 45 shows the data from Section D, Item 3 on the number of staff development activities, funded through AB 1725 staff development monies the respondent had attended.

> ITEM 3: How many Staff Development Council sponsored and funded activities within the district have you participated in since spring, 1989?

Table 45

Number of Staff Development Activities Respondent Had Participated in Since Spring, 1989

Number	N=577 Frequency	Percent
0	294	51.0
1	84	14.6
2	80	13.9
3	29	5.0
4	22	3.8
5	10	1.7
6	6	1.0
7 - 12	6	1.0
Missing	46	8.0
Total	577	100.0

After eliminating the zero respondents and the missing respondents, two-fifths of the respondents had attended one to twelve in-house staff development activities during the one-year period that they have been offered.

The number of community college courses taken by respondents for credit is shown in Table 46 for Section D, Item 3.

ITEM 3: How many community college courses on any topic have you taken for credit during the past two years?

Table 46

Number of Community College Courses Respondent Had Taken for Credit During the Past Two Years

Number	N=577 Frequency	Percent
0	397	68.8
1	46	8.0
2	37	6.4
3	18	3.1
4	20	3.5
5	9	1.6
6 - 10	19	3.2
11 - 24	6	1.1
Missing	25	4.3
Total	577	100.0

Twenty-seven percent of the respondents had taken one to twenty-four community college courses of varying units for credit during the past two years. The mean was .985 courses; the median was zero.

Section D, Item 5 dealt with the number of courses that respondents had taken for credit during the past two years. Table 47 shows the results.

ITEM 5: How many university courses on any topic have you taken for credit during the past two years?

Table 47

Number of University Courses on Any Topic Respondent Had Taken for Credit During the Past Two Years

Number	N=577 Frequency	Percent
0	441	76.4
1	26	4.5
2	24	4.2
3	9	1.6
4	11	1.9
5	6	1.0
6 - 10	18	3.1
11 - 15	7	1.2
16 - 30	7	1.2
Missing	28	4.9
Total	577	100.0

Approximately, nineteen percent, or 108 respondents, had been taking university courses for credit during the past two years. Nine percent had taken one or two courses. Five percent had taken more than six credit courses from universities in that time period. The mean was one course; the median was zero. Five percent did not respond.

Table 48 presents the results of Section D, Item 6 on the number of institutional projects or grants in which the respondent had been involved.

ITEM 6: How many classroom or institutional projects or grants have you participated in during the past two years?

Table 48

Number of Institutional Projects or Grants that Respondent Had Participated in During the Past Two Years

Number	N=577 Frequency	Percent
0	473	82.0
1	34	5.9
2	23	4.0
3	6	1.0
4	5	.8
5	1	.2
8	1	.2
12	1	.2
20	1	.2
Missing	32	5.5
Total	577	100.0

This question had breadth that covered external grants and internal improvement of instruction grants, staff development grants, and grants received from the federal and state governments for student support services. Twelve percent of the respondents had participated in one through twenty grants during the past two years. The mean was .301; the median was zero.

The number of published materials written by the respondents is shown in Table 49 for Section D, Item 7.

ITEM 7: How many books, articles, or papers in ERIC have you written in the past two years?

Table 49

Number of Books, Articles, or Papers that Respondent Had Prepared in the Past Two Years

Number	N=577 Frequency	Percent
0	482	83.5
1	29	5.0
2	10	1.7
3	5	.9
4	3	.5
5	3	.5
6 or more	6	1.0
Missing	38	6.9
Total	577	100.0

Approximately, ten percent of the faculty and staff had written a book, an article, or had submitted a document into the ERIC Clearinghouse during the past two years. Five percent, or 29 employees, had written one such work; the other five percent had prepared two or more documents. Seven percent of the respondents did not reply to this item.

Table 50 presents the data for Section D, Item 8 on the number of presentations that respondents had made during the past two years.

ITEM 8: How many presentations (speeches, art shows, recitals, tournaments) have you personally done during the past two years?

Table 50

Number of Presentations of Various Types that Respondent Personally Participated In During the Past Two Years

Number	N=577 Frequency	Percent
0	289	50.1
1	33	5.7
2	49	8.5
3	33	5.7
4	23	4.0
5	21	3.6
6 - 10	56	9.7
11 - 15	15	2.6
16 - 20	8	1.4
21 or more	16	2.8
Missing	34	5.9
Total	577	100.0

More than two-fifths of the faculty and staff had participated in various kinds of presentations. Such presentations included speeches, art shows, recitals, and tournaments in professional support of professional activities.

In Table 51, the percentage of a segment that has taken a university course on a topic is shown as a portion of the segment, rather than of the whole, in order to provide more concrete information.

ITEM 9: Have you taken a university course in the following areas?

Table 51

Results on University Courses Taken

Course and Segment	N=577 Frequency	Percent of Segment
Mission and Development of the Community College		
Administration	15	38.5
Faculty	38	13.4
Classified Staff	3	2.1
Total	56	9.7
Management Theory and Applications		
Administration	26	63.4
Faculty	69	24.6
Classified Staff	16	11.3
Total	111	19.2
Methodologies of Curriculum Development and Teaching		
Administration	18	46.2
Faculty	124	43.7
Classified Staff	5	3.5
Total	147	25.5
Learning Theories and Applications		
Administration	21	52.5
Faculty	115	40.9
Classified Staff	13	9.4
Total	149	25.8
Strategies for Assessing and Counseling Students		
Administration	14	35.9
Faculty	68	24.3
Classified Staff	7	5.0
Total	89	15.4

Less than ten percent of the personnel of the South County Community College District had ever taken a course on the mission and development of community colleges. Thirty-nine percent of the administrators had taken such a course, while only thirteen percent of the faculty had.

Substantially more personnel from all three segments had taken university courses in management theory and applications. Sixty-three percent, or twenty-six, of the administrators had taken one or more courses in management. Twenty-five percent of the faculty and eleven percent of the classified staff had a course in management.

Approximately, forty-five percent of the administrative and faculty respondents had taken a university course in curriculum design and development. Whereas 52.5 percent of the administration had taken a course in learning theories, only forty-one percent of the faculty had done so. Almost ten percent of the classified staff who responded to this item had taken a course in learning theories and applications.

More administrators (35.9%) had taken a university course in assessment and counseling strategies than faculty (24.3 percent). Five percent of the classified staff had taken a course in this area.

The results of Table 52 for Section D, Items 9B - 13B describe the interest of respondents in taking a university course for further training.

ITEM 9B: Would you take an university course in the following area (assuming it was offered in a relatively convenient place)?

Table 52

Respondent's Interest in University Courses

Course and Segment	N=577 Frequency	Percent of Segment
Mission and Development of the Community College		
Administration	11	26.2
Faculty	63	22.7
Classified Staff	40	24.8
Total	114	19.0
Management Theory and Applications		
Administration	23	59.0
Faculty	78	28.3
Classified Staff	62	40.0
Total	163	28.0
Methodologies of Curriculum Development and Teaching		
Administration	10	25.6
Faculty	122	44.5
Classified Staff	33	21.3
Total	165	28.0
Learning Theories and Applications		
Administration	8	21.1
Faculty	132	47.7
Classified Staff	59	38.8
Total	199	34.0
Strategies of Assessing and Counseling Students		
Administration	12	29.3
Faculty	116	41.6
Classified Staff	46	30.1
Total	174	30.0

Respondents from all three sectors were interested in taking university courses that would enhance their knowledge and skills for their jobs. The respondents who would take a course listed, provided that it was offered relatively conveniently, ranged from 114 persons, or nineteen percent, to 199 persons, or thirty-four percent.

Nineteen percent, or 114, of the respondents were interested in taking a university-credit course that dealt with the mission, development, and functions of the community college. Such a course interested more than one-fifth of the administrators, faculty, and classified staff.

In the aggregate, 163, or twenty-eight percent, of the respondents were interested in taking a university course in Management Theory and Applications. Almost three-fifths of the management, two-fifths of the classified staff, and a quarter of the faculty were interested in such a course.

Twenty-eight percent of the respondents were interested in taking a course on Curriculum Development and Teaching. Of this group, 122 faculty, or 44.5 percent of that segment, were interested in such a course. More than one-fifth of the classified staff and administration were also interested.

Thirty percent of the respondents expressed interested in a course on Strategies of Assessing and Counseling Students. Forty-two percent, or 116, of the faculty would take such a course. Thirty percent of the administrators and classified were interested in this course.

Of the five courses provided, the course on Learning Theories and Applications drew the most interest with 199 "yes" responses, totaling thirty-four percent of the aggregate. Faculty (47.7%) were most interested in taking such a course. Classified staff (38.8%) and administration (21.1%) followed.

Section E: Comments

Various comments were made by the respondents in the two parts of Section E. They are summarized in this section. Detailed responses are presented in Appendixes F and G.

The comments of the classified staff reflected discontent with the opportunities and incentives available to them for staff development. Two staff members reflected strong perceptional gaps between them and other segments within the colleges. A few offered to present staff development topics at an in-house workshop.

The comments of the part-time faculty seemed to place emphasis on being included in the decision making processes involved with division meetings or meeting with faculty peers who teach the same classes. Other comments indicated that the respondents did not make the connection between staff development and themselves as part-time personnel of the district. Some part-time respondents expressed interest in presenting a workshop, if they were compensated.

A number of comments of the full-time faculty praised the actualization of a needs assessment among faculty and staff. Others made some points about content of workshops and the need to do more to support faculty efforts. Several volunteered to share their expertise with other personnel in various ways.

Although management respondents did not make comments under the first part of Section E, two did indicate a willingness to present a workshop on a topic on the second part. The topics that they would present are combined with topics that faculty and other staff would be willing to present are in Appendix G.

Summary

This chapter has presented the data of the needs assessment survey completed by 577 full-time and part-time administrators, faculty, and classified staff. The data were collected from 77.5 percent of the district's personnel.

The perceptions of the faculty and staff regarding staff development were channelled in four major areas. These major areas were (1) the topics of in-house workshops and other kinds of activities that would provide information and/or skills wanted, (2) the kinds of incentives that were valued, (3) the status of the organizational climate in relationship to the support of staff development, and (4) the times workshops should be offered.

CHAPTER 5

INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Previous chapters of this study have presented (1) an introduction to the problem; (2) a review of the related literature; (3) the design and methodology of the study; and (4) a presentation of the data collection and analysis. This chapter has six sections: (1) Summary of the Study; (2) Principal Findings of the Study; (3) Conclusions; (4) Recommendations for a Human Resource Development Model, (5) Recommendations for Further Study, and (6) Diffusion and Implementation.

Summary of the Study

The study was designed to provide answers to three questions concerning the perceptions of administrators, faculty, and classified staff toward staff development in a two-college district in California. A primary aim was to determine in the aggregate the areas of information and skills through workshops and other activities that full-time and part-time personnel perceived as they would support. Another aim was to determine what incentives would motivate personnel to participate in AB 1725 funded staff development activities. A third aim was to determine the perceived optimum supportive organizational climate in relationship to the perceived real operating environment.

Findings of the Study

The major findings of the study include five parts: (1) workshop topics to develop information and skills that personnel indicated they would probably or definitely participate in; (2) types of activities that participants perceived would provide them with needed information and skills; (3) workshop topics relating to institutional needs that respondents identified as potential workshops to attend; (4) perceptions of the present organizational operating climate as it relates to support of staff development; and (5) institutional motivators for participation in development activities.

The criteria, which were used to delineate principal findings from minor findings, focused on an affirmative response rate of sixty percent or more affirmative on an item. This percentage of response meant that at least 346 participants would be interested in the topic, activity, or incentive at one time or another. Where appropriate, significant differences of perceptions of interest by the segments have been included.

Findings on Information and Skills Workshops

One of the seven topics in Section C: Development of Academic Knowledge and Skills (items 17-23) met the criteria. Seventy-one percent of the respondents indicated that they would attend workshops on Item 21: Sharing new

findings and thinking within and among subject areas. Administrators (79%) were far more interested than faculty (59%) in Item 17: Presentations of experiences and findings from employees returning from a conference, Sabbatical Leave, or Leave of Absence.

Two of the eight topics in Section C, Development of Technical Knowledge and Skills (items 24-31) reflected strong interest in computer technology: (1) Item 24: Computer technology applications that would facilitate operations in one's area (79%) and (2) Item 25: WordPerfect word processing (60%).

One of the fourteen topics in Section C, Improvement of Teaching and Student Services (items 32-45) received 62 percent. This topic pertained to Item 41: Methods for improving service to and working with culturally diverse people. The faculty were interested in workshops on five additional topics--Item 33: Methodologies on teaching a subject and on student learning, Item 35: Strategies for increasing student motivation, Item 36: Methodologies for developing critical thinking skills across the curriculum, Item 38: Strategies for promoting better study skills among students in a course, and Item 40: Cultural differences of Asian and Middle Eastern countries that characterize our multicultural students.

All three of the topics on Section C, Development of the Whole Person (items 46-48) received more than

55 percent. Physical fitness, wellness, and balancing one's life received the highest responde at 62 percent.

Commentary on Information and Skills Workshop

There were five main areas that all personnel seemed to be interested in getting more information or in developing more skills. These areas were directed toward coping with the information explosion within the world, the rapid technological change in the United States, the new institutional IBM hardware and WordPerfect software standards within the district, and the change in student and employee populations within the district, and wellness.

Findings for Other Activities to Gain Information and Skills

Five activities out of eleven from Section C, Staff Development Activities (items 49-59) received more than sixty percent positive responses. All three segments were highly interested in Items 49 and 50: Visitation programs with counterparts at other local University of California campuses, local California State University campuses, and community colleges. All three segments expressed interest in visiting counterparts at other public or private organizations, Item 53. Furthermore, all three segments were interested in meeting with counterparts at the other college in the district, Item 51. Lastly, sixty-two percent expressed interest in Item 55: Observation of a selected colleague's class or job for ideas and techniques.

Lastly, the issue of staff/faculty mentoring was separated into three items, 57 for staff, 58 for full-time faculty, and 59 for part-time faculty. Administrators (77%) and classified staff (67%) provided positive responses to experienced employees mentoring new employees. Two-thirds of the faculty regarded mentoring new full-time faculty and part-time faculty as a priority activity.

Commentary on Other Activities to Gain Information and Skills

The need for sharing and for collaboration was evident in the findings of this section by all personnel. The perceived needs for information collection and interaction were evident in the high level of interest in visitations to other institutions and within the district.

This need for sharing and collaboration was also important on an individual-to-individual level, through the interest in mentoring. Every employee of the district has experienced an induction process into the district. Faculty and administrators have received a joint, administratively-controlled new faculty and new administration orientation that lasts for two days prior to instruction. In addition, the new faculty have attended one-hour meetings twice a quarter during the first year. All of the sessions have been based upon lecture presentations by one administrator after another. Classified staff have been hired, given their papers, and shown their workstation. So, another aspect of the

interest in the observation and mentoring activities may be a response to the existing administratively-controlled, lecture-oriented processes of induction.

Findings on Workshops Relating to Institutional Change

Five of the eleven items in Section C: Meeting Changing Institutional Needs (items 6-16) met the sixty percent criteria. They are listed in descending order of response importance.

1. Item 8: Strategies for problem solving and working with different kinds of people (72.2%);

2. Item 9: Determination of division or area goals, priorities, problems (72.1%);

3. Item 10: Techniques to enhance leadership and communication skills (70.4%);

4. Item 14: Strategies for working with and within a multicultural population (68.4%); and

5. Item 7: Strategies for stress management, cooperation, and teambuilding (65.7%).

Sixty percent or more of the administrators indicated that they would attend a workshop on all of the eleven topics in this section. The classified staff indicated strong interest in six items: Items 6 through 11. The faculty expressed interest in items 8 through 10 and 14 through 16. The faculty and classified staff agreed with the administrators in their interest in Item 8: Problem solving and working with different types of people, Item 9:

Determination of division or area goals, priorities, problems, and Item 10: Techniques to enhance leadership and communication skills.

Commentary on Workshops Relating Institutional Change

The two colleges have been separated and a district formed during the past year with a new chancellor. A new president of Las Positas College started two weeks after the survey was done. A new president and dean of instruction were in the selection process at Chabot College. The empty positions and uncertainty related to them seem to be reflected in the results of this section. In addition, there have been long-term perceptions of values within the organization. These were investigated in Section B.

Findings on Section B: Organizational Operating Environment

An aggregate of ninety-one percent of the personnel agreed with item 1 of Section B that the organization of a community college should promote an environment that encourages and facilitates the development and continuous learning of its personnel in meeting its mission and goals. In contrast to that finding, only forty-three percent of the item 2 respondents perceived that the historically-developed environment of the colleges of the district fostered development of its personnel.

The work environment was not seen too positively. Fewer than half the respondents perceived the organiational

environment as one that encouraged open discussion of job-related tasks. Only 40 percent of the respondents viewed the organization as supporting teamwork and collegial sharing. Thirty-eight percent perceived the internal systems as providing responsive and timely feedback on matters that affect individual jobs.

Commentary on Section B: Organizational Operating Environment

These findings are supported by the high interest of the segments in the workshops of Section C: Meeting Changing Institutional Needs that dealt with each of these issues. These findings also emphasize the dichotomy between the "myth" of the educational environment as a workplace and the bureaucratic functioning within the community college.

Findings on Motivators for Staff Development Activities

Five of the twelve items (60-72) received sixty or more percent affirmative response. These are listed in descending order.

Monetary considerations were the highest perceived incentive to personnel. Item 60: More salary incentives for participation in staff development activities was perceived by 76.4 percent of the respondents as the greatest motivator. Faculty (80.9%) viewed it most important; classified staff (78.8%) second; administrators (60.9%) third.

Time replacements for staff development were important to the respondents. Item 70: Leaves of Absence to update received 66.6 percent of the responses. Item 61: Reassigned time for research and development was perceived by 63.4 percent of the respondents as an incentive. Item 64: Provision of a substitute or replacement during a staff development activity was an incentive to 62 percent of the respondents.

A centralized site for personnel to use as a drop-in resource and training center was an incentive. Item 66: A resource center with computer equipment and staff assistance received 61.4 percent response.

The times that staff development activities are to be held are corollary incentives. None of the Section C, Workshop Times (items 73-79) received sixty percent response, probably due to the range of full-time and part-time, day and evening employees. During the day, Friday afternoons, or afternoons as arranged were perceived as good times by 57.9 percent of the respondents. College Hour (11 a.m. to noon when no classes are offered) was perceived by 56.7 percent as being a better time than lunch hours (48.2%) when classes are scheduled. Non-instructional days between quarters or during the summer (45.8%) and before the start of September's instruction (49.6%) were perceived as good times for activities.

Staff development days in place of instructional days were favored by administrators, faculty, and classified

staff--reported that they would take a university course related to community college functions.

Commentary on Motivators for Staff Development Activities

The findings indicate that faculty and staff can be motivated to become involved in professional and personal development activities through two main incentives--salary compensation and time replacement. Over three-quarters of both the faculty and classified staff view monetary considerations factored to salaries as important incentives. Monetary factors are incentive factors to administrators, too, but appear to be less important than they are to the other two segments. The second greatest motivator in promoting staff development is time replacement. It was perceived that time replacement could be done through substitutes on short-term or long-term bases or by replacing instructional days with staff development days. Fifty percent of the respondents perceived pre-instruction days in September and other non-instruction days as opportune times for staff development activities.

The faculty and staff's interest in monetary considerations as incentives for participation may be influenced by the institution's support of conference and workshop attendance. Approximately the same percentage of personnel pay most of the costs for their own conferences as take advantage of institutionally paid conferences.

The findings show that less than ten percent of the employees have taken a course regarding the mission and development of community colleges. The implications of this finding indicates that new faculty and staff orientations to the institution require indoctrination and/or training in this area so that all personnel can be aimed toward compatible workplace goals and standards. The items on the questionnaire were appropriately selected and served the needs assessment function for the range of personnel of the institution. Of all the 115 closed responses, the lowest response was to Item 34 on developing behavioral objectives; it received thirty-one percent response, mostly from faculty.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are made:

1. Full-time and part-time, day and evening administrators, faculty, and classified staff view continuous, life-long learning important to performance within the institution.

2. The areas of interest of staff development activities among the segments of personnel relate to present job tasks and supplemental areas of interest.

3. Some areas of information and skills as perceived needed by administrators, faculty, and classified staff are similar, despite the originating constituency. These areas

essentially encompass organizational management techniques and strategies involving leadership, communication among all types of people, sharing of new information, setting goals and priorities, and processes of decision making.

4. Demographic and economic changes will continuously affect the various societies in the United States. If the personnel of the community colleges are to provide relevant education of rapidly changing information and skills to a changing population, it is critical that the concept and promotion of human resource development become institutionalized within the mission and goals of the organization.

5. The primary areas that all segments prioritized for staff development involved (1) sharing of and collaborating of information, (2) developing computer skills, and (3) enhancing people-related interactions to support the activities and functions of the colleges.

6. Personnel perceived three main motivators for participating in staff development: (1) salary increments, (2) replaced time, and (3) a resource center with appropriate equipment, materials, and staffing assistance.

7. If personnel perceive a conference, technical training seminar, or workshop as providing pertinent information and/or skills, they will pay the cost when not funded by the college.

8. Some personnel may have limited time for participating in in-house provided staff development

activities when they are already taking courses at a community college or university.

9. Two-thirds of the faculty, administration, and many classified staff perceived days set aside specifically for staff development activities as an incentive to participate in professional growth.

10. Fewer than twenty percent of the personnel have taken courses related to the mission and purposes of the community college, to its teaching/learning activities, or to its support services.

11. All segments of personnel are interested in university courses that would prepare them and/or enhance their activities within their college.

12. Communication processes involving individuals need to become a higher institutional priority.

Recommendations for a Human Resource Development Model

1. The administratively-oriented induction processes for new full-time community college faculty and administrators need to be exchanged with a collegial model that involves faculty, administrators, and classified staff in the planning process. The induction process for faculty and administrators should include at least two weeks of generalized pre-service training and at least two years of in-service specialized training through an internal Human Resource Development Institute with workshops and sub-support through mentors. The induction process for

classified staff could be integrated with the tours of the college and review of the mission and goals of the institution for faculty and administrators, as appropriate throughout the school year.

2. The induction program for part-time faculty needs to be expanded from one two-hour evening into a broader base that might include available university courses, as well as internal workshops on computers and teaching techniques.

3. A mentor program should be developed that supports a core of information/skills workshops so that each mentor does not do a full one-on-one induction program.

4. In-house workshops and other human resource development activities for personnel should be available and operating year round.

5. In-house workshops can be held either generically with the emphasis on collegial, collaborative interaction or specifically with concentration on particular information and/or skills development of one sector.

6. Visitations of personnel to other community colleges, universities, and local public/private organizations serves as an alternative to group activities, such as conferences and workshops.

7. Multiple alternatives and opportunities need to be available to these adult learners so that they can customize, professionalize, and personalize the development of information and skills that they need.

8. Resources of local universities can be utilized to provide extension and regular courses on topics relevant to community college personnel.

9. A Staff Resource Center for personnel should be developed and maintained in the Learning Resource Centers at each college.

10. The pay schedules of the personnel segments should be reviewed to supplement them with continuous reward for participation in staff development activities of all types.

11. Staff development should be institutionalized by including it on the organizational chart under an area such as Personnel or Institutional Planning.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations are made for other future studies:

1. Investigate the relationship between the attitudes of faculty toward the organization's operating environment and their attitudes toward classroom teaching/learning and innovation.

2. Study the relationship between administrators' perception of the organizational operating environment and their leadership and followership performances.

3. Explore the diverse segment of classified staff as a participants in the functioning of the community colleges.

4. Research the participation levels of various personnel in relationship to salary incentives such as Professional Development Increments.

5. Explore the participation levels of various personnel in relationship to reassigned time options.

6. Study the part-time faculty on their training for teaching and learning in the classroom, since they have become primary sources for new faculty.

7. Investigate the content, activities, and length of orientation and induction programs for new faculty and administrators.

8. Study the cultural support of the organization in relationship to faculty and instructional staff's views of instructional innovation and the teaching/learning relationships in the classroom.

9. Explore the identity that new and continuing faculty and staff have with the mission and goals of their institution and community colleges in general.

10. Replicate this study and compare findings to expand the generalizability of the conclusions.

Staff development in community colleges has been considered important since the late 1960s that ended an era of student unrest. The movement of the 1970s and early 1980s focused on instruction and improvement of faculty performance. It was based primarily upon development plans conceived by administrators, some who had never taught in a classroom. The interest of the legislators and of CEOs in

early incentive retirements for faculty, as well as the concerns expressed about the effectiveness of higher education in the media, during those years reflect the general lack of success of that effort.

By investing five million dollars per year for the past two years, the California legislature broadened the scope of staff development to also include administrators and classified staff. The AB 1725 legislation additionally stipulated that three factors had to be in force within each district in order to receive the ADA-related (Average Daily Attendance) funding for staff development. These factors include that (1) a council of faculty, administrators, and classified staff provide the decision making and implementation of tasks, (2) a needs assessment be made of personnel, and (3) the findings be integrated into a Human Resource Development Plan.

Prior to this study, the staff development committees of the colleges and the district council had been operating in its advisory function within the district strictly through a proposal process. Any employee who recognized a staff development need prepared a proposal to fund the need. The proposal was reviewed and approved or denied by the committees and/or council for recommendation to the Board of Trustees. This study implemented the needs assessment for the district that was required by the AB 1725 legislation and provides essential recommendations

for the framework of the Human Resources Development Plan for the personnel of the district.

Diffusion and Implementation

The results and recommendations will be presented as a report to the Staff Development Council, to the five Staff Development Committees at both colleges, to the Faculty Senates at both colleges, and to the district's chancellor and two college presidents. Summarized reports of the findings will be communicated to the faculty, administration, classified staff, and Board of Trustees through four to five Staff Development Newsletters. Specific results and recommendations that impact collective bargaining will be directed to the Chancellor and the district's negotiating team and to the faculty's collective bargaining association president and negotiating team.

This document will be sent to the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges (UCLA) for possible inclusion in the ERIC system. In addition, articles regarding specific sections of the literature review and findings will be written for community college journals, including the Community College Review and the Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Dennis M. and Mary Hamm. "Filling the Leadership Vacuum: The Need for A National Education Plan." Educational Record, 67:21-23. Fall, 1986.

Adams, Keith and Richard Whiteman. Procedures for Developing an Inservice Industry/Education Exchange Program: Planning and Implementation Guide. ERIC ED 237 128, 1983.

Alfano, Kathleen, Florence Brawer, Arthur Cohen, and Leslie Koltai. "The Evaluation of the Effect of AB 1725 on Statewide Faculty and Staff Development." A draft report produced under contract with the California State Chancellor's Office. January 26, 1990.

Alfred, Richard L. "Social Changes and Community College Faculty: Is Effective Teaching Becoming Obsolete?" Community College Review, 14:9-15. 1986.

Alfred, Richard L., Paul Elsner, and Jan LeCroy, eds., Emerging Roles for Community College Leaders. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 46. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

American Federation of Teachers. "Creating a Profession of Teaching." American Educator, 14:8-21, Summer, 1990.

American Society for Training and Development. Training America: Learning to Work for the 21st Century. Alexandria, Virginia: American Society for Training and Development, 1989.

Anderson, Robert. "The Community Survey: An Effective Tool for Administrative Planning and Decision Making." Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 2:11-15. 1980.

Anderson, Robert A., Jr. Performance Appraisal and Merit Compensation. Paper Presented at the 64th Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C. April 10, 1984.

Andrews, Hans A. Awarding Merit Based on Higher Level Needs. ERIC ED 266 840, 1986a.

Andrews, Hans A. "Merit Pay and Merit Recognition Plans in Community and Junior Colleges." The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, 4:46-50. Summer, 1986b.

Andrews, Hans A. Merit in Education: Assessing Merit Pay as the Catalyst to Pay & Evaluation Reforms. ERIC ED 309 790, 1987.

Anrig, Gregory R. "Teacher Education and Teacher Testing." Phi Delta Kappan, 67:447-451. February, 1986.

Apps, Jerold W. Higher Education in a Learning Society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Armes, Nancy and Terry O'Banion. "The Role of the Chief Executive Officer in Strategic Staff Development." In Strategic Management in the Community College. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 44. Ed. G. A. Myran. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, December, 1983.

Armistead, L. P., D. E. Vogler, R. C. Branch. "Impact of Microcomputers on Community College Faculty." Community College Review, 15:38-44. Fall, 1987.

Arrsola, Raoul. Establishing Successful Faculty Evaluation and Development Programs. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 11. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Astin, Alexander W. Minorities in American Higher Education: Recent Trends, Current Prospects, and Recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Astin, Alexander and Calvin Lee. "Current Practices in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers." In The Junior College. Ed. J. E. Roueche and B. R. Herrscher. New York: Selected Academic Readings, 1970.

Atkin, J. Myron. "Why Educational Research Can't Keep Up with Reform." Phi Delta Kappan, LXXX1:200-205. November, 1989.

Atschuler, Thelma C. and Suzanne L. Richter. Maintaining Faculty Vitality. New Directions for Community Colleges, No.13. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Austin, Ann E. and Zelda F. Gamson. Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10, 1983.

Astuto, Terry A. and David L. Clark. Merit Pay for Teachers, An Analysis of State Policy Options. ERIC ED 291 206, 1985.

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973.

Baker, George A. "Toward Academic Excellence in the Community College: A Rebuttal Essay." Community College Review, 15:8-15. Spring, 1988.

Baker, George A., John E. Roueche, and Robert R. Rose. "Transformational Leaders in the Community College: The Best of the Best." Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 58:36-41. June/July, 1988.

Baldridge, J. V., D. V. Curtis, G. Ecker, and G. I. Riley. Policy Making and Effective Leadership: A National Study of Academic Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Baldwin, Roger, ed. Incentives for Faculty Vitality. New Directions for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Baldwin, Roger G. and Robert T. Blackburn, eds. College Faculty: Versatile Human Constraint. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Ball, S. and I. Goodson. Teachers' Lives and Careers. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Falmer Press, 1985.

Banks, Debra. A Staff Development Plan for A Community College. ERIC ED 277 413, 1986.

Barthlow, Robert. "Don't Overlook Classified Staff." Community and Junior College Journal, 44:34. November, 1973.

Beardsley, Katherine L. "The Relationship of Achievement Styles to Job Satisfaction of Office Workers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota. December, 1983.

Beck, Arthur C. and Ellis D. Hillmar. Positive Management Practices. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

Beer, Michael, Bert Spector, Lawrence, D. Quinn Mills, and Richard Walton. Managing Human Assets. New York: The Free Press, 1984.

Belker, J. "A Survey of California Institutions of Higher Education." Journal of Staff, Program, & Organizational Development, 1:75-78. Winter, 1983.

Bender, Louis W. and James O. Hammons. "Adjunct Faculty: Forgotten and Neglected" Community and Junior College Journal, 43:20-22. October, 1972.

Bender, Louis W. and Maureen D. Lukenbill. "Let's Begin with Ourselves." Community and Junior College Journal, 55:16-18. October, 1984.

Bennett, John B. "Ambiguity and Abrupt Transitions in the Department Chair's Role." Educational Record, 63:54-56. Fall, 1982.

Bennett, John B. "What Lies in the Future for Department Chairpersons?" Educational Record, 64:52-56. Spring, 1983a.

Bennett, John B. Managing the Academic Department. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1983b.

Bennis, Warren G. "An O.D. Expert in the Cat Bird's Seat." Journal of Higher Education, 44:389-398. 1973.

Berdie, Douglas R. and John F. Anderson. Questionnaires: Design and Use. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974.

Bergquist, William H. and Steven R. Phillips. A Handbook for Faculty Development. Washington, D.C.: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Bergquist, William H. and Steven R. Phillips. A Handbook for Faculty Development. Washington, D.C.: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.

Berman, Paul and Daniel Weiler. Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education, Volume I - Executive Summary and Conclusions. Berkeley, California: Berman, Weiler Associates, 1988.

Berman, Paul, Jo-Ann Itili, and Daniel Weiler. Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education, Volume II - Findings. Berkeley, California: Berman, Weiler Associates, 1988a.

Berman, Paul, Jo-Ann Itili, and Daniel Weiler. Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education. Volume III - Appendix. Berkeley, California: Berman, Weiler Associates, 1988b.

Bess, James L. ed. College and University Organization: Insights from the Behavioral Sciences. New York: New York University Press, 1984.

Bishop, Leslee J. Staff Development and Instructional Improvement. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.

Blackburn, Robert T., G. Pellino, A. Boberg, and C. O'Connell. "Are Institutional Improvement Programs Off-Target?" Improving Teaching and Institutional Quality. Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education, 1980.

Blackburn, Robert T. "Faculty Career Development: Theory and Practice." In Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity. Ed. S. M. Clark and D. R. Lewis. New York: Teachers College Press, 1985.

Blackburn, Robert T., Colman O'Connell, and Glenn Pellino. "Evaluating Faculty Performance." In Improving Academic Management. Ed. P. Jedamus, M. Peterson and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Blocker, Clyde, Louis Bender, and Richard Richardson. Governances for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Blocker, Clyde, Robert H. Plummer, and Robert C. Richardson. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Bloom, Benjamin S. "Learning for Mastery." Reprinted in Toward Instructional Accountability. Ed. J. E. Roueche and B. R. Herrscher. New York: Westinghouse Learning Press, 1973.

Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. 1985 Basic Agenda. Sacramento: Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, 1985.

Boyer, C. M. and D. R. Lewis. "Faculty and Institutional Vitality in Higher Education." In Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity: Critical Perspectives for Higher Education. Ed. S. M. Clark and D. R. Lewis. New York: Teachers College, 1985.

Bradford, David L. and Allan R. Cohen. Managing for Excellence. New York: John Wiley, 1984.

Bradshaw, Roxanne. "The Timidity Temptation: No Time to Yield." Thought & Action, 1:67-74. Spring, 1985.

Bridge, Peter G. "Externships: Two-Way Street." Community and Junior College Journal, 51:35-38. 1980.

Burleigh, Rita. "Evaluation Strategies for Staff Development." A presentation made at the Third Annual Statewide Staff Development Preconvention Workshop at Santa Clara, California. November 17, 1989.

Burne, Keven, Allen Bundy, and David McArthur. "Faculty Development from the Inside." Change, 21:43-49. May/June, 1989.

Bush, Ronald W. and W. Clark Ames. "The Maricopa Colleges." Educational Record, 65:22-26. Winter, 1984.

Byrd, Ann Marie. Four Dimensions of Staff Development Activities as Related to Part-Time Community College Instructors' Needs, Awareness, and Levels of Participation. ERIC ED 265 890, 1985.

Caetano, Donald. "A Model for Changing Faculty Attitudes." Faculty Development & Evaluation in Higher Education, 4:1-6. Spring, 1978.

Cain, Rudolph A. "Equal Opportunity and the Community College." Journal of Negro Education, 51:16-28. 1982.

Caldwell, Corrinne. Community College Faculty Careers. ERIC ED 269 112, 1986.

Caldwell, Noel. Instruction-Related Faculty Development Needs in a System of Two-Year Technical Colleges. ERIC ED 302 278, 1988.

California State Department of Education. California Mentor Teacher Program. ERIC ED 241 473, 1983.

Caplette, Michele. "Back to Training Basics." Training and Development Journal, 42:49-56. May, 1988.

Cappa, Judith. Part-time Faculty: Higher Education at a Crossroads. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report, No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1984.

Carleo, Susan. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of the Los Angeles Community College District's Retraining Program. ERIC ED 259 807, 1985.

Carnevale, Anthony Patrick. "Higher Education's Role in the American Economy." Educational Record, 64:6-16. Fall, 1983.

Caron, Geraldine T. A Survey of Developmental Needs of Full-time Faculty at Florida Keys Community College. Unpublished practicum, Nova University, 1979.

Carson, Virginia and Mary Deming. "Mentoring Part-Time Faculty." Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 60:39-41. April/May, 1990.

Carvell, Joan. On Course: A Report to the Legislature on Vocational Education and Career Counselor Inservice Training, 1986-88. ERIC ED 307 927, 1988.

Case, Chester H. Professional Staff Development: A Community College Model. ERIC ED 151 050, 1976.

Case, Chester H. "Supporting Faculty Leadership for Change." In Renewing the American Community College. Ed. W. L. Deegan, D. Tillery, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Cato, Jimmy E. Designing a Staff Development Curriculum for Community College Personnel at College of Alameda. ERIC ED 168 650, 1977.

Centra, J. A. Faculty Development Practices in United States Colleges and Universities. New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Centra, J. A. "Student Ratings of Instruction and Their Relationship to Student Learning." American Educational Research Journal, 14:17-24. 1977.

Centra, J. A. "Maintaining Faculty Vitality Through Faculty Development." In Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity: Critical Perspectives for Higher Education. Ed. S. M. Clark and D. R. Lewis. New York: Teachers College, 1985.

Cervero, Ronald M. Effective Continuing Education for Professionals. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Champion, Dean J. and Alan M. Sear. "Questionnaire Response Rate: A Methodological Analysis." Social Forces, 47:227-339. March, 1969.

Chandler, Margaret K. and Daniel J. Julius. Faculty vs. Administration: Rights Issues in Academic Collective Bargaining. New York: The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, 1979.

Charland, William, Jr. and Celia Marshak. "Renewing Scientific and Technical Careers." Thought and Action, IV:95-104. Fall, 1988.

Chavez, Jose. Summary of Results: Staff Development Survey. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.

Chell, Elizabeth. The Psychology of Behavior in Organizations. London: The MacMillan Press, 1987.

Chickering, Arthur W., Zelda F. Gamson, and Louis M. Barsi. "Institutional Inventory: Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education." Milwaukee, Wisconsin: The Johnson Foundation, 1987.

Christensen, Frank A. "Staff Development: Perceptions of Faculty and Administrators at Selected Community Colleges in Illinois." Ed.D. Major Applied Research Project, Nova University. 1975.

Chruden, Herbert and Arthur Sherman. Readings in Personnel Management: The Utilization of Human Resources. Palo Alto, California: South-Western Publishing Co., 1980.

Claggett, Craig. Teacher Stress at a Community College: Professional Burnout in a Bureaucratic Setting. ERIC ED 195 310, 1980.

Clark, Burton. "The Role of Faculty in College Administration." In Studies of College Faculty. Ed. L. Wilson and others. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1961.

Clark, Shirley, Carol Boyer, and Mary Corcoran. "Faculty and Institutional Vitality in Higher Education." In Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity: Critical Perspectives for Higher Education. Ed. S. M. Clark, and D. R. Lewis. New York: Teachers College Press, 1985.

Clover, Vernon T. and Howard L. Balsley. Business Research Methods. Columbus, Ohio: Grid Publishing, Inc., 1984.

Clough, Carol E. Development of a Questionnaire for a Study of Employers' Usage of Typewriters and Computer Hardware/Software in a California Community College District. ERIC ED 314 111, 1988.

Clough, Carol E. A Study to Survey Faculty Priorities of Financial Alternatives in Collective Bargaining in a Community College. An Unpublished paper, June, 1989.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Junior College Teacher Preparation." In The Junior College. Ed. J. E. Roueche and B. R. Herrscher. New York: Selected Academic Readings, 1970.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. Focus on Learning--Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College. ERIC ED 019 939, 1968.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. "New Teacher Preparation." In The Junior College. Ed. J. E. Roueche and B. R. Herrscher. New York: Academic Readings Division, 1970.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. The Collegiate Function of Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Cohen, Arthur M. and John E. Roueche. Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Monograph Series, 1969.

Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College Presidency. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Cole, Charles C. Jr. Improving Instruction. AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 4, 1982.

Cooper, John D. A Paradigm for Staff Development in the Community College. ERIC ED 274 387, 1981.

Corbally, John E. and Dristin Holmberg-Wright. "Identifying Administrative Staff Needs."In Improving Academic Management. Ed. Paul Jedamus, Marvin Peterson and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Cothran, Tom. "Build or Buy?" In Designing and Delivering Cost-Effective Training. Ed. J. Gordon. Minneapolis: Lakewood Books, 1988.

Cottingham, T. W. , M. F. Neuman, and D. M. Sims. "Is There Practical Help for the Part-Time Faculty--Our New and Neglected Majority?" Community College Review, 9:12-17. Summer, 1981.

Craig, Robert L., ed. The Training and Development Handbook. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Cross, K. Patricia and Thomas A. Angelo. Classroom Assessment Techniques. Ann Arbor, Michigan: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, 1988.

Cruise, Robert J., Lyndon G. Furst, and Rudolf E. Klimes. "A Comparison of Full-Time and Part-Time Instructors at Midwestern Community College." Community College Review, 8:52-56. Summer, 1980.

Daley, D. M. "Differing Perceptions Between Men and Women over Personnel Management Practices: Gender-Related Differences Among Iowa Public Employees." Public Personnel Management Journal, 13:345-354. 1984.

Daresh, John C. and Robyn D. McComas, ed. Expanded Bibliography on Staff Development and Inservice Education. ERIC ED 291 152, 1984.

Davidson, Judy. Faculty Attitudes. ERIC ED 154 890, 1976.

Deal, T. E. and A. A. Kennedy. Corporate Cultures. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1982.

Detwiler, Wayne L., Sr. "T & I Teachers Go To College--and Thrive!" Vocational Education Journal, 60:42-43. 1985.

Dickerson, Joan, Janet Norby, and Lulu Schroder. "A Review of Pertinent Research Regarding Merit Pay." Eastern Washington University, 1984.

Diener, Thomas. "Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction." Community/Junior College Quarterly Research and Practice, 9:347-57. 1985.

Dill, L. A., W. B. S. Crowston, and E. Elton. "Strategies of Self-Education." Harvard Business Review, 43:119-130. November, 1965.

Dillman, Don A., James Christenson, Edwin Carpenter, and Ralph Brooks. "Increasing Mail Questionnaires Response: A Four State Comparison." American Sociological Review, 39:746-755. October, 1974.

Doerr, Arthur H. "Hands Across Academe: A Modest Proposal." Educational Record, 67:52-54. Fall, 1986.

Donegan, Patricia Morris. Recent Perspectives on Faculty Development in Community Colleges: An Annotated Bibliography. ERIC ED 277 429, 1987.

Donnelly, Brian. "Merit Pay: Opportunity for Recognition, Reward." Community and Junior College Journal, 54:32-34. December-January, 1984.

Douglas, Joel M., ed. Collective Bargaining in a Period of Retrenchment. National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions. Proceedings, Eleventh Annual Conference, April, 1983.

Drucker, Peter. The Practice of Management. New York: Harper & Bros., 1954.

Drucker, Peter. The Changing World of the Executive. New York: Times Books, 1982.

Duke, Daniel L. "Setting Goals for Professional Development." Educational Leadership, 47:71-75. May, 1990.

Durbak, Ivan and Nicholas Sadnytzky. "The Hidden Crisis in Education: Faculty Computer Illiteracy." Community College Review, 12:7-13. 1984.

Dyer, W. G. Insight in Impact: Strategies for Interpersonal and Organizational Change. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1984.

Dziuba-Malick, Victoria. "A Study of Community College Faculty Inservice Education From An Andragogical Perspective." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, 1988.

Eaton, J. S. "Society 2000: Presidents and Prophecy." Community and Junior College Journal, 52:6-10. 1980.

Eble, Kenneth. Professors as Teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Eble, Kenneth. The Art of Administration. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Eble, Kenneth. The Aims of College Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Eble, Kenneth and Wilbert McKeachie. Improving Undergraduate Education Through Faculty Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Eells, W. C. and E. V. Hollis. The College Presidency 1900-1960: An Annotated Bibliography. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1961.

Ehrenhalt, Samuel M. "The Nature of Education." Current, 257:15-24. November, 1983.

Eison, James. "Assessing Professional Development Interests of Faculty at a State University." The Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 4:61-65. Fall, 1986.

El Camino College. Classified Staff Handbook. Torrance, California: El Camino College District, 1989.

Eliason, C. H. "Part-time Faculty: A National Perspective." In M. Parsons, ed. Using Part-time Faculty Effectively. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 30. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Elioff, Ione H. "A Study of Part-Time Faculty and Recommendations for Faculty Development at Vista College, A noncampus Community College." Research in Education, November, 1980. Also ERIC ED 188 725.

Elioff, Ione H. The Challenge of Faculty Development for Part-timers in Noncampus Colleges. ERIC ED 243 502, 1983.

Elizur, D. "Facets of Work Values." Journal of Applied Psychology, 69:379-389. 1984.

Elsner, K. First Year Evaluation Results from Oklahoma's Entry-Year Assistance Program. ERIC ED 242 706, 1984.

Elsner, Paul A. "Management as a Creative Human Resource." Community and Junior College Journal, 51:5-9. 1981.

Evans, Geraldine A. "Building Excellence in Your College." In Community Colleges, The Future, and SPOD. Ed. R. Brass. Stillwater, Oklahoma: New Forums Press, Inc., 1984.

Fagan, Michael and Glen Walter. "Mentoring Among Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, 76:116. November-December, 1982.

Feldman, Marvin J. "The Community College Comes of Age." Educational Record, 63:26-28. Spring, 1982.

Filan, Gary L. "Influence of Ascribed and Achieved Social Statuses, Values, and Rewards on Job Satisfaction Among Community College Faculty." Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 10:113-122. 1986.

Finkelstein, Martin J. The American Academic Profession: A Synthesis of Social Scientific Inquiry. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1984.

Fink, L. Dee. First Year on the Faculty: A Study of 100 Beginning College Teachers. ERIC ED 222 109, 1982.

Fitzgerald, Richard F. "An Evaluation of A Faculty Planned Instructional Development Program at Florida Keys Community College." Ed.D. Major Applied Research Project, Nova University. 1980.

Forman, Marshall. The Faculty That Stays Together Grays Together: The Faculty Development Movement. ERIC ED 307 933, 1989.

Freedman, Mervin, Wesley Brown, Norbert Ralph, Robert Shukraft, Michael Bloom, Nevitt Sanford. Academic Culture and Faculty Development. Berkeley, California: Montaigne Press, Inc., 1979.

Frymier, Jack. "Bureacracy and the Neutering of Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan, 69:9-14. September, 1987.

Furniss, W. Todd. "New Opportunities for Faculty Members." Educational Record, 62:8-15. Winter, 1981.

Furniss, W. Todd. The Self-Reliant Academic. Washington, D.C.: American Association to Higher Education, 1984.

Gable, Robert and Vincent Rogers. "Taking the Terror Out of Research." Phi Delta Kappan, 68:690-695. May, 1987.

Gaff, Jerry G. Toward Faculty Renewal: Advances in Faculty Instructional, and Organizational Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Gaff, Jerry G. ed. Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Gaff, Jerry G. "Toward the Improvement of Teaching." In Staff Development in Higher Education. Ed. D. C. Teathers. New York: Kogan Publishers, 1979.

Gaff, Jerry G. General Education Today. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Gaff, Sally S., C. Festa, and J. Gaff. Professional Development: A Guide to Resources. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Gagne, Robert M. and Leslie J. Briggs. Principles of Instructional Design. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. "Teacher Mentors: A Review of the Literature." Journal of Teacher Education, 37:6-11. January-February, 1985.

Gamson, Zelda F. and Associates. Liberating Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty--Issues and Problems, A Preliminary National Appraisal. ERIC ED 012 177, 1967.

Garrison, Roger H. "The Teacher's Professional Situation." The Junior College. Ed. J. E. Roueche and B. R. Herrscher. New York: Academic Readings, 1970.

Gaynes, Colleen. "The 'Who' and 'What' of Instructional Leadership." Thrust, 19:40-42. May/June, 1990.

Gillespie, Diane. "Claiming Ourselves as Teachers." Change, 21:56-58. July/August, 1989.

Gleazer, Edmund J. This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Gleazer, Edmund. J. Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Gold, Yvonne. "Recognizing and Coping with Academic Burnout." Contemporary Education, 16:134-138. Spring, 1988.

Goldberg, Malcolm. "The Faculty Member as Entrepreneur." In Responding to New Missions. Ed. M. A. Marty. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Goldberg, Myles H. "Another Look at Merit Pay Programs." In Chruden, H. J. and A. W. Sherman, ed. Readings in Personnel Management. Palo Alto: South-Western Publishing Co., 1980.

Gould, J. W. The Academic Deanship. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Green, Madeleine F. and Theordore Kellogg. "Careers in Academe: Confirming the Conventional Wisdom?" Educational Record, 63:40-43. Spring, 1982.

Griffin, Q. A. "Teacher Induction: Research Issues." Teacher Education, 36:42-46. January-February, 1985.

Groner, Norman. "Leadership Situations in Academic Departments: Relations Among Measures of Situational Favorableness and Control." Research in Higher Education, 8:125-143. 1978.

Gross, Richard. "Faculty Growth Contracts." In Professional Development in Higher Education. Ed. T. B. Coward. Washington: McManis Associates, 1978.

Groth, David A. "Administration's Achilles Heel." Community and Junior College Journal, 44:28-30. October, 1973.

Grove, Andrew S. "Why Training is the Boss's Job." In Productivity Through People. Ed. W. B. Werther, Jr., W. A. Ruch, and L. McClure. San Francisco: West Publishing Company, 1986.

Guthrie-Morse, B. "The Utilization of Part-time Faculty." Community College Frontiers, 7:8-17. Spring, 1979.

Grymes, Robert J. Jr. A Survey and Analysis of Part-time Instructors at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College. ERIC ED 125 687, 1976.

Haddad, M. and M. E. Dickens. "Competencies for Part-time Faculty--the First Step." Community College Journal, 49:22-24. November, 1978.

Hague, H. Executive Self-Development. London: The MacMillan Press, 1974.

Hall, Douglas T. and Associates. Career Development in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Hall, Jay. The Competence Connection: A Blueprint for Excellence. The Woodlands, Texas: Woodstead Press, 1988.

Hall, Judith I. and Donna R. Petrie. Resources for Renewal: A Survey of Professional Development Practices in League for Innovation Community Colleges. ERIC ED 291 434, 1987.

Hamlin, Richard V. "Community College Faculty and Administrative Views of the Faculty Development Movement." Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1980.

Hammons, James O. "Staff Development Isn't Enough." Community College Review, 10:3-7. 1982.

Hammons, James O. and Walter Hunter. "The Perceived Problems of Community College Department/Division Chairpersons as Revealed by the Nominal Group Process." Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 1:163-170. 1977.

Hammons, James O. and Terry H. Wallace. "Staff Development Needs of Public Community College Department/Division Chairpersons." Community College Research Quarterly, 2:55-76. 1977.

Hammons, J. O., T. H. Wallace, and G. Watts. Staff Development in the Community College. ERIC ED 154 887, 1978.

Hammons, J. O. and G. Watts. "Evaluating Part-time Faculty." Journal of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, 1:19-22. Spring, 1983.

Harless, J. H. Behavior Analysis and Management. Falls Church, Virginia: Harless Educational Technologists, Inc., 1970.

Harless, J. H. "Front-End Analysis." In What Works At Work: Lessons from the Masters. Ed. George Dixon. Minneapolis: Lakewood Books, 1988.

Harnish, Dorothy. Focus on Faculty: A Report on Professional Development at Niagara County Community College, 1985-86. ERIC ED 286 570, 1986.

Harnish, Dorothy, and Donald G. Creamer. "Faculty Stagnation and Diminished Job Involvement." Community College Review, 13:33-39. Winter, 1985-86.

Harris, Norman C. and John F. Grede. Career Education in Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Hart, C. "Scholarship in the Disciplines." In A Seminar for New Deans. Ed. C. C. Ling. St. Louis: Missouri: American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, 1967.

Hauff, Elaine and Douglas Berdie. "Community College Part-Time Faculty: Who Are They?" Thought and Action, V:73-82. Spring, 1989.

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Robert Baumgartner. "Factors Affecting Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires." American Sociological Review, 43:50-53. August, 1978.

Heermann, Barry, ed. Changing Managerial Perspectives. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Heermann, Barry, Cheryl Enders, and Elizabeth Wine, eds. Serving Lifelong Learners. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Heger, Herbert K. "Revolution in the Small Colleges." Educational Record, 63:18-25. Fall, 1982.

Heie, Harold and David Sweet. "Faculty Development Through Growth Contracts." In Androgogy in Action. Ed. M. S. Knowles and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Heimler, Charles. "The College Department Chairman." The Educational Record, 67:158-163. Spring, 1967.

Henderson, A.D. The Innovative Spirit. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Hendrick, Irving G. California Education: A Brief History. San Francisco: Boyd & Fraser Publishing Company, 1980.

Hennecke, Matthew J. "Mentors and Proteges: How to Build Relationships That Work." In Designing and Delivering Cost-Effective Training. Ed. J. Gordon, R. Zemke, and P. Jones. Minneapolis: Lakewood Books, 1988.

Hill, John P. "Funds for Excellence: A College Faculty/ Industry Partnership." Community College Review, 13:12-15. 1985.

Hoffman, John R. and Roger A. Pool. "Part-time Faculty: Their Own Needs Assessment." Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 2:26-27. 1979.

Holloway, Mary Louise. "Performance Appraisal." In Issues in Personnel Management. Ed. R. I. Miller and E. W. Holzapfel, Jr. New Directions for Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Hudgins, James L. Merit Pay and Faculty Evaluation. ERIC ED 273 333, 1985.

Huling-Austin, Leslie. "A Synthesis of Research on Teacher Induction Programs and Practices." In Teacher Induction. Ed. J. Reinhartz. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1989.

Huling-Austin, Leslie and Sheila Murphy. Assessing the the Impact of Teacher Induction Program. ERIC ED 283 779, 1987.

Hutton, Jerry B. "Job Satisfaction of Community College Faculty." Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 9:317-324. 1985.

Imperial Valley College. "Staff Development Survey." An unpublished paper. Imperial, California. January, 1989.

Irby, David and Alice Kuramoto. "Distinguished Teaching Awards: Criteria for Excellence." Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, 4:16-20. 1986.

Jackson, Hattie R. "New Employee Orientation." A presentation at the National Council of Staff, Program, and Organization Development. Costa Mesa, California, 1990.

Jacobson, R. L. "AAUP's Leader Assays Decline in Faculty Morale, Governance." Chronicle of Higher Education, 15,17. June 27, 1984.

Jedamus, Paul, Marvin W. Peterson and Associates. Improving Academic Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Johnson, Rita B. and Stuart R. Johnson. "A Strategy for In-service Instructional Development." Developing Staff Potential. Ed. T. O'Banion. New Directions for Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Kanter, Hal. An Analysis of Faculty Development in Selected Community Colleges/Junior Colleges. ERIC ED 248 942, 1984.

Kanter, Rosabeth M. "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe." Perspectives on Leadership, Current Issues in Higher Education No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1:3-9. 1979.

Kanter, Rosabeth M. "The Attack on Pay." Harvard Business Review, 65:60-67. March-April, 1987.

Kastner, Harold. "A System-Wide Approach." Community and Junior College Journal, 43:14-16. November, 1973.

Katzell, Raymont, Daniel Yankelovich, Mitchell Fein, Oscar Ornati, and Abraham Nash. "Improving Productivity and Job Satisfaction." In Readings in Personnel Management: The Utilization of Human Resources. Ed. H. Chruden and A. Sherman. Palo Alto, California: South-Western Publishing Co., 1980.

Keller, George. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Kelly, Diana K. A Corporate Human Resources Approach to Faculty Development in the Community College. ERIC ED 283 582, 1987.

Kelly, Diana K. "A Human Resources Development Approach to Part-time Faculty." A paper presented at the National Conference for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development. Costa Mesa, California. November 3-7, 1990a.

Kelly, Diana K. Reviving the "Deadwood": How to Create an Institutional Climate to Encourage the Professional Growth and Revitalization of Mid-Career Faculty in\ the Community College. ERIC ED 318 518, 1990b.

Kidder, Louise H. Research Methods in Social Relations. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981.

Kiefer, Jerry. "Foundation Faculty Fellowships Find 'Real World.'" Community and Junior College Journal, 54:33-34. 1984.

Kintzer, Frederick C. "Advantages of Open-Response Questions in Survey Research." Community/ Junior College Research Quarterly, 2:37-46. 1977.

Kintzer, Frederick C. A Case for the College Handbook in an Era of Collective Bargaining. ERIC ED 219 096, 1982.

Kintzer, Frederick C. Two-Year College Handbooks and Manuals: Past, Present, Future. ERIC ED 225 603, 1983.

Klevans, Deborah R. Developing a Needs Assessment Plan in Continuing Professional Education. ERIC ED 297 092, 1987.

Knapp, D. C. "Management: Intruder in the Academic Dust." Educational Record, 49:55-59. 1969.

Koos, Leonard V. The Junior College Movement. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1925.

Kuh, George D. and Elizabeth J. Whitt. The Invisible Tapestry. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1988.

Lacey, Paul A., ed. Revitalizing Teaching Through Faculty Development. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 15. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Lavrakas, Lefteris. "Flexible Calendar: Pilot Program at Saddleback Community College." Community College Review, 8:58-62. 1980-81.

Leas, David E. and Roy C. Rodriquez. "Identifying the Ineffective University Dean." Thought and Action, III:97-102. Spring, 1987.

LeBoeuf, Michael. The Greatest Management Principle in in the World. New York: Putnam, 1985.

Levinson, H. "Executive Development: What You Need To Know." Training and Development Journal, 35:84-95. 1981.

Lhota, Robert L. Multidimensional Model: Adjunct Staff Development. ERIC ED 180 510, 1976.

Light, Donald, Jr. "Thinking About Faculty." Daedalus, 1:258-264. Fall, 1974.

Lightman, Marjorie, Esther Katz, and Dorothy Helly. "The Literature on Part-Time Faculty." Thought & Action, III:47-62. Spring, 1987.

Lindsay, Carl A., James L. Morrison, and E. James Kelley. "Professional Obsolescence: Implications for Continuing Professional Education." Adult Education, XXV:3-22. 1974.

Lombardi, John. The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in Community Colleges. ERIC ED 089 811, 1974.

Long, Edward J., Jr. Analysis of Professional Development of Part-Time Continuous Education Instructors at St. Petersburg Junior College. ERIC ED 162 678, 1978.

Lord, Thomas R. Spotlighting Faculty Scholarship at the Two-Year College. ERIC ED 301 264, 1988a.

Lord, Thomas R. "Spotlighting Faculty Scholarship at the Two-Year College." Thought and Action, IV:105-109. Fall, 1988b.

Lorenzo, Albert. "Setting the Foundation for Institutional Renewal." A presentation at the conference of the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development. Costa Mesa, California. November 3-7, 1990.

Loucks-Horsley, Susan, Catherine Harding, Margaret Arbuckle, Lynn Murray, Cynthia Duba, and Martha Williams. Continuing to Learn: A Guidebook for Teacher Development. Andover, Maryland: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, 1987.

Lynton, Ernest A. "Higher Education's Role in Fostering Employee Education." Educational Record, 64:18-25. Fall, 1983.

MacKenzie, Donald and Ted Urich. "Support Staff Workshops: A Method To Develop PR Skills and Improve Productivity." NASSP Bulletin, 68:137-139. April, 1984.

Magnesen, Vernon A. and Lynn Sullivan Parker. "How to Develop, Market, and Manage a Comprehensive Staff & Organizational Development Program." A monograph available through the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, 1988.

Maher, T. and F. Ebben. "Part-time Faculty." In Employing Part-Time Faculty. Ed. D. W. Leslie. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Mallinger, Mark. "Stress Management: An Organizational and Individual Responsibility." Training and Development Journal, 42:16-17. February, 1986.

Manley, Katherine K and Others. An Assessment of the Training Needs of Career-Vocational Counselors, Job Placement and Career Resource Center Personnel in Michigan. ERIC ED 274 877. August, 1986.

Martin, Warren Bryan. "Qualities of a College of Character." Educational Record, 63:32-38. Fall, 1982.

Martorana, S. V. "Research: Lifeblood of Community College Vitality." Community College Review, 13:4-5. Spring, 1986.

Martorana, S. V. "Reflections on a Movement." Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 60:42-48. August/September, 1989.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Surviving the Eighties. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

McCardell, Nora E. and Jo-Anne H. Willment. Innovation Policies and Practices for Human Resource Development in a Canadian Community College. ERIC ED 301 261, 1987.

McCright, Gerald J. "A Study of Perceived Professional Development Needs of Part-Time Faculty Members at Marshalltown Community College." Unpublished practicum, Nova University, 1983.

McDade, Sharon A. Higher Education Leadership: Enhancing Skills Through Professional Development Leadership. Washington D.C.: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5, 1987.

McDougle, Larry G. "Orientation Program for Part-time Faculty Members." Community College Review, 8:20-23. Summer, 1980.

McKay, John R. Merit Pay: A Plan That Works. ERIC ED 270 181, 1986.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. Teaching Tips. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1986.

McLagan, Patricia A. and David Bedrich. Models for Excellence: The Results of the ASTD Training and Development Competency Study. Alexandria, Virginia: American Society for Training and Development, 1983.

McMillen, Liz. "Faculty-Development Programs Seen Often Marginal to Important Campus Needs." Chronicle of Higher Education, 16-17. April, 1987.

Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Medsker, Leland L. and Dale Tillery. Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education Series. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Mehrotra, C.M.N. Teaching and Aging. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Meierhenry, Wesley C. "Computers in Education." In Computers in the Classroom. Ed. J. B. Margolin and M. R. Misch. New York: Spartan Books, 1970.

Melendez, Winfred A. and Rafael de Guzman. Burnout: The New Academic Disease. Washington, D.C.: Association for Study of Higher Education, 1983.

Menges, Robert. "Career-span Faculty Development." College Teaching, 33:181-184. Fall, 1985.

Menges, Robert J. and B. Claude Mathis. Key Resources on Teaching, Learning, Curriculum, and Faculty Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1988.

Merson, Thomas. "Teaching to New Populations." In Perspectives on the Community-Junior College. Ed. W. K. Ogilvie and M. R. Raines. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.

Mertes, Barbara. "A Summary Dealing with Selected Professional Development Programs in South County Community College District." An unpub_ished paper. February 3, 1976.

Miami-Dade Community College District, Florida. Recommendations Concerning New Faculty. ERIC ED 313 079, 1989.

Miller, Charles. "Instructional Skills Workshops." An unpublished paper. Santa Rosa, California: Santa Rosa Junior College, 1989.

Miller, Richard I. The Assessment of College Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979.

Miller, Richard I. "Appraising Institutional Performance." In Improving Academic Management. Ed. P. Jedamus, M. Peterson and Associates. Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.

Millman, Jason. "Improving Instruction through Research." Improving College and University Teaching, 31:13-15. Winter, 1983.

Mirabile, Richard J. "Designing CD Programs the OD Way." Training and Development Journal, 42:38-41. February, 1986.

Missouri University, Columbia: Department of Special Education. Comprehensive System of Personnel Development: Needs Assessment Considerations. Project on Cooperative Manpower Planning in Special Education. ERIC ED 228 806, 1981.

Mitzel, H. E., ed. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: Free Press, 1982.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Montgomery College. Part-Time Faculty Handbook 1975-76. ERIC ED 112 980, 1975.

Moore, Kathryn M., Today's Academic Leaders: A National Study of Administrators in Community and Junior Colleges. ERIC ED 264 922, 1985.

Moore, William, Jr. Blind Man on a Freeway: The Community College Administrator. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Morrisey, George L. Performance Appraisals in the Public Sector. Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1983.

Morrison, Diane. "The Instructional Skills Workshop Program: An Inter-Institutional Approach." To Improve the Academy. British Columbia: Ministry of Education, 1985.

Mountain Empire Community College, Virginia. Faculty Evaluation and Merit Pay at Mountain Empire Community College. ERIC ED 257 481, 1985.

Mt. San Antonio Community College. Classified Employees Handbook 1988-1989. Walnut, California: Mt. San Antonio Community College District, 1988.

Mulkeen, Thomas and Toby Tetenbaum. "An Integrative Model of Teacher Education and Professional Development." Educational Horizons, 23:85-87. Winter, 1987.

Murnane, C. and A. Cohen. "Merit Pay and the Evaluation Problem." OATYC Journal, 11:15-28. 1986.

Naisbitt, John. Megatrends. New York: Warner Books, 1982.

NEA Special Committee on Educational Technology. "NEA Report on Educational Technology." CUE Newletter, 12:40-45. November/December, 1989.

Neher, William R. and Leopold Hauser. "How Computers Can Help Adults Overcome the Fear of Learning." Training, 19:52-55. February, 1982.

Newton, Anne. Teacher Quality. Andover, Massachusetts: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, 1987.

Nordvall, Robert C. The Process of Change In Higher Education Institutions. AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 7, 1982.

Novak, Charles. The Perceptions of Selected Community College Staff Toward Inservice Staff Development Programs in Illinois Community Colleges. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1974.

Novotney, Jerrold. "Retooling For Tomorrow." The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, 4:51-52. Summer, 1986.

O'Banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1973.

O'Banion, Terry. "Staff Development: A New Priority for the Seventies." The College Review Board, 99:25-33 Spring, 1976.

O'Banion, Terry. Developing Staff Potential. New Directions for Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

O'Connell, Colman. "College Policies Off-Target in Fostering Faculty Development." Journal of Higher Education, 54:662-675. November-December, 1983.

Odiorne, George S. The Human Side of Management. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1987.

Office of the Chancellor. Study of Part-time Instruction. Sacramento, California: California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor, 1987.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Current Developments in Teacher Induction Programs. ERIC ED 269 406, 1986a.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Approaches for Staff Development for Part-time Faculty. ERIC ED 270 180, 1986b.

Oliva, L. Jay. "Faculty Rise to the Challenge Grant." Educational Record, 67:44-46. Fall, 1986.

O'Neill, Thomas M. and Robert P. Heaney. "Taking the Initiative in Accreditation." Educational Record, 63:57-60. Fall, 1982.

Orlich, Donald C. Staff Development: Enhancing Human Potential. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1989.

Parilla, Robert E. "Scholarship in Community Colleges." College Teaching, 35:111-112. Summer, 1987.

Parsons, Michael. Part-time Faculty: A Statewide Model for Development. ERIC ED 161 484, 1978.

Parsons, Michael. ed. Using Part-Time Faculty Effectively. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 30. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Pascale, Richard. "Fitting New Employees Into the Company Culture." In Productivity Through People. Ed. W. Werther, Jr., W. Ruch, and L McClure. New York: West Publishing Company, 1986.

Patrick, C. and J. K. Caruthers. Management Priorities of College Presidents. ED ERIC 212 210, 1979.

Patton, Carl V. and David D. Palmer. "Maintaining Faculty Vitality Through Midcareer Change Options. In Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity. Ed. S. M. Clark and D. R. Lewis. New York: Teachers College Press, 1985.

Pedras, Melvin. "A Planning Model for the Development and Implementation of a Staff Development Program for Community College Part-time Faculty." Community/ Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 9:71-77. 1985a.

Pedras, Melvin J. A Model for Staff Development of Community College Part-time Faculty. ERIC ED 257 514, 1985b.

Pelsma, Dennis. The Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey: A Preliminary Report on a Measure of Teacher Stress and Job Satisfaction and the Implications for School Counselors. ERIC ED 286 094, 1987.

Peralta Community College District. "Staff Development Needs Assessment." An unpublished paper. Oakland, California: Peralta Community College District, 1989.

Peters, J. T. and R. H. Waterman, Jr. In Search of Excellence: Lessons Learned from America's Best Run Companies. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Peterson, Tim. Part-Time Faculty Compensation and Staff Development in Three Kansas City Area Community Colleges. ERIC ED 225 615, 1982.

Petrovich, Janice and Holly Hexter. Campus Approaches to Retraining. ERIC ED 268 914, 1986.

Phillips, Jack J. "Training Supervisors Outside the Classroom." Training and Development Journal, 42:46-49. February, 1986.

Pierce, David R. and Ann Kieffer Bragg. "The Community College for the Future: A State Agency Viewpoint." In Community College, the Future, and SPOD. Ed. R. J. Brass. Stillwater, Oklahoma: New Forums Press, 1984.

Posner, Bruce and Bo Burlingham. "The Hottest Entrepreneur in America." Inc. 10:44, January, 1988.

Queralt, Magaly. The Role of Mentor in the Career Development of University Faculty and Academic Administrators." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Miami, 1981.

Quinn, Michael T. "Staff Development: A Process of Growth." The Education Digest, LV:16-18. March, 1990.

Rabalais, Michael and John Perritt. "Instructional Development for Part-time Faculty." Community College Review, 11:20-22. 1983.

Rancho Santiago Community College. "Staff Development Needs Assessment Survey, 1989-90." An unpublished paper. 1989.

Ratcliff, James L. "Should We Forget William Rainey Harper?" Community College Review, 13:12-18. Spring, 1986.

Reeser, Clayton. "Executive Performance Appraisal--The View from the Top." In Readings in Personnel Management: The Utilization of Human Resources. Ed. H. Chruden and A. Sherman. Palo Alto, California: South-Western Publishing Co., 1980.

Renkiewicz, Nancy. Indicators and Measures of Successful Community Colleges: A Report to the 59th Annual CACC Convention. ERIC ED 301 286, 1988.

Richardson, Richard. "Staff Development: A Conceptual Framework." Journal of Higher Education, XLVI:303-311. May/June, 1975.

Richardson, Richard. "An Essay Review: George B.Vaughan's The Community College Presidency." Community College Review, 14:4-7. Fall, 1986.

Richardson, Richard. "Improving Effectiveness Through Strategic Planning." Community College Review, 15:28-34. Spring, 1988.

Richardson, Richard C., Clyde Blocker, and Louis Bender. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Richman, Barry and Richard Farmer. Leadership, Goals, and Power in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Riday, George, Ronald Bingham, and Thomas Harvey. "Satisfaction of Community College Faculty: Exploding a Myth." Community College Review, 12:46-50. Winter, 1984-85.

Ridnour, Rick E. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Characteristics of Self-Actualization and of Job Satisfaction of Selected Faculty in Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, Iowa State University, 1985.

Robertson, George Hawthorne. "A Proposed In-Service Training Program for Academic Administrators in Ontario Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1976.

Rossett, Allison and Joseph W. Arwad. Training Needs Assessment. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1987.

Rostek, Stephen and Deborah Kladivko. "Staff Development and Training." In Issues in Personnel Management. New Directions for Community Colleges No. 62. Ed. R. I. Miller and E. W. Holzapfel, Jr. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Summer, 1988.

Roueche, John E. Role of the Department/Division Chair in the Community College. Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University, 1973.

Roueche, John E. "Insuring Excellence in Community College Teaching." Leadership Abstract, League of Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program. June, 1990.

Roueche, John E. and John R. Boggs. Junior College Institutional Research: The State of the Art. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

Roueche, John E. and Barton R. Herrscher, ed. The Junior College. New York: Academic Readings, 1970.

Roueche, John E. and K. Watkins. "A Commitment to Great Teaching." Community and Junior College Journal, 52:22-25. 1982.

Roueche, Suzanne, ed. "The Instructional Skills Workshop: A Mechanism for Instructional and Organizational Renewal." Innovation Abstracts, IX:1-2. April, 1987.

Rummel, J. Francis and Wesley C. Ballaine. Research Methodology in Business. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.

Ryder, Henry and George Perabo. The Complex Challenge of Professional Development: Current Trends and Future Opportunities. ERIC ED 265 911, 1985.

Sacramento City College. "Staff Development Survey of Organizational Climate and Developmental Activities." An unpublished paper. Sacramento, California: Los Rios Community College District, 1989.

Sahl, Robert J. "Assessment: Develop Company-Specific Employee Attitude Surveys." Personnel Journal, 44:46-51. May, 1990.

Santa Fe Community College. Part-Time Faculty Professional Development Plan. ERIC ED 305 595, 1989.

Santa Rosa Junior College. "AB 1725 Staff Development Fund Questionnaire Responses." An unpublished paper. Santa Rosa, California: Santa Rosa Junior College District, 1989.

Sarason, S. B. Work, Aging and Social Change: Professionals and the One Life-One Career Imperative. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Schneider, B. and M. D. Zalesny. Human Needs and Faculty Motivation. ERIC ED 216 602, 1981.

Schultz, R. E. "The Preparation of College and University Administrators." Phi Delta Kappan, 49:390-394. 1968.

Schultz, Raymond E. and William J. Roed. Report on Inservice Needs of Community College Part-time Occupational Instructors. ERIC ED 156 290, 1978.

Schurr, George. Freeing the "Stuck" and Aiding the Terminated: Expanding the Career Horizons of Tenured College Professors. ERIC ED 195 197, 1980.

Schuster, Jack H. "The Faculty Dilemma: A Short Course." Phi Delta Kappan, 68:275-282. December, 1986.

Schuster, Jack H. "The Personal Dimension of Faculty Development." Thought and Action. V:61-72. Spring, 1989.

Scull, Sharon. "AB 1725 Human Resources Development Plan." An unpublished paper. Glendale, California: Glendale Community College. May, 1988a.

Scull, Sharon. "Staff Development Program, 1989-90." An unpublished paper. Glendale, California: Glendale Community College. August, 1988b.

Seegmiller, Jesse F. Job Satisfaction of Faculty and Staff at the College of Eastern Utah. ERIC ED 139 489, 1977.

Seldin, Peter. Evaluating and Developing Administrative Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. Handbook for Effective Department Leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977.

Sewell, Donald H., Charles Brydon, and William Prosser. Report on a Statewide Survey About Part-time Faculty in California. ERIC ED 118 195, 1976.

Shaw, George C. "Debunking the Myth of Academe." Thought & Action, V:5-16. Spring, 1985.

Shawl, William F. Staff Development: A New Imperative. ERIC ED 243 512, 1984.

Shreeve, William, Muriel Radebaugh, Janet Norby, William Goetter, T. K. Midgley, Arnold Stueckle, and Barbara Michelle. "Contracting for Merit Pay." College Teaching, 33:155-158. Fall, 1985.

Shulman, Carol Herrnstadt. Old Expectations, New Realities: The Academic Profession Revisited. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Siegel, M. E. "Faculty Development in Liberal Arts Colleges." In Effective Approaches to Faculty Development. In Nelson, W. C. and M. E. Siegel. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1980.

Sletto, Raymond. "Pretesting of Questionnaires." American Sociological Review, 5:192-196. April, 1940.

Smith, A. "Staff Development Goals and Practices in United States Community Colleges." Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 5:209-225. April/June, 1981.

Smith, Barbara Leigh and M. Rosetta Hunter. "Learning Communities: A Paradigm for Educational Revitalization." Community College Review, 15:45-51. Spring, 1988.

Smith, Cindra. "Building a Comprehensive Staff Development Model." Paper presented at the 4CSD/CACC Conference, Orange County, California, 1989.

Smith, P. Alternatives for Developing Teaching Effectiveness. ERIC ED 301 115, 1988.

Snyder, David Pearce. The Strategic Context of Education in America: 1985-1995. National Education Association, Office of Planning, 1984.

Snyder, Jacqueline Irene. "The Importance and Effectiveness of Faculty Development Activities at Selected League for Innovation Community Colleges." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1988.

Socolow, Daniel J. "How Administrator Get Their Jobs." Change, 9:42-44. May, 1978.

Solomon, Cynthia. "Relationships Among Measures of Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Job Satisfaction as Perceived by Faculty In Two-Year Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio University, 1987.

Sorcinelli, Mary Deane. "Career Goals of Faculty: Future Trends & Directions." Journal of Staff, Program and Organization Development, 4:9-12. Spring, 1986.

Sparks, Dennis. "Teacher Burnout: A Teacher Center Tackles the Issue." Today's Education, 14:13-18. November, 1979.

Spinetta, Katrin I. "The Professionalization of Part-Time Faculty in the California Community College." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1988.

Stalcup, R. J. and W. A. Thompson. The Community College President: A Contemporary Janus. ERIC ED 187 402, 1980.

Staniford, Edward F. Chabot College: The First Twenty Years. Hayward, California: South County Community College District, 1981.

Starling, Roy. "Professor as Student: The View from the Other Side." College Teaching, 35:3-7. Winter, 1987.

State of California. Assembly Bill (AB) 1725: Comprehensive Community College Reform. Sacramento: 1988.

Stern, Joanne V. Staff Members As Lifelong Learners. ERIC ED 306 997, 1989.

Stine, Vance. Job Attitude Survey for Classified Personnel. ERIC ED 136 869, 1977.

Stout, Robert T. "Staff Development For Teachers." Policy Briefs. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 7:1-4. 1988.

Strong, Richard, Harvey Silver, J. Robert Hanson, Robert Marzano, Pat Wolfe, Tom Dewing, and Wende Brock. "Thoughtful Education: Staff Development for the 1990s." Educational Leadership, 47:25-29. February, 1990.

Strother, Deborah Burnett. "Inservice Education." Practical Applications of Research. 5:1-4. March, 1983.

Sudman, Seymour and Norman M. Bradburn. Asking Questions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Swick, Kevin J. Stress and Teaching. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1989.

Swick, Kevin and Patricia Hanley. Stress and the Classroom Teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1987.

Terrell, Roland. "Institutionalization: A Step Into the Future." In Community Colleges, The Future, and SPOD. Ed. R. Brass. Stillwater, Oklahoma: New Forums Press, 1984.

Thornbury, Robert, ed. Teachers' Centres. New York: Agathon Press, 1974.

Thornton, James W. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Titlow, Frank. "An Analysis of Staff Development Need Perceptions in Florida's Public Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1980.

Todd-Mancillas, William R. "Academic Burnout: A Call to Action." Thought and Action, IV:65-74. Fall, 1988.

Townsend, Barbara K. "Faculty Role in Clarifying the Mission." Community College Review, 12:4-7. Fall, 1984.

Turner, Marjorie A. and Herbert E. Phillips. The Care and Feeding of Part-time Faculty. Gaithersbury, Maryland: Associated Faculty Press, Inc., 1981.

Twombly, Susan B. "Boundaries of an Administrative Labor Market." Community College Review, 13:34-44. Spring, 1986.

Twombly, Susan B. "The Importance of Beginnings: The Relationship of Entry Positions to Career Outcomes for Two-Year College Presidents." Community College Review, 15:14-21. Fall, 1987.

Valek, Millicent. "Faculty Renewal: Strategies for Vitality." The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, 4:93-97. Winter, 1986.

Van Dyke, Janice. "Placing Teachers in Industry." VocEd, 58:48-49. 1983.

Varah, Leonard. Teacher Induction Program (An Inservice Program for First-Year Teachers). ERIC ED 265 150, 1985.

Varah, Leonard, Warren Theune, and Linda Parker. "Beginning Teachers: Sink or Swim?" In Teacher Induction. Ed. J. Reinhartz. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1989.

Vaughan, George B. The Community College in America. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges National Center for Higher Education, 1982a.

Vaughan, George B. "Burnout: Threat to Presidential Effectiveness." Community and Junior College Journal, 52:10-13. 1982b.

Vaughan, George B. "Presidential Leadership." In Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. Ed. G. B. Vaughan and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Vaughan, George B. "Forging the Community College Mission." Educational Record, 65:24-29. Summer, 1984.

Vaughan, George B. "In Pursuit of Scholarship." American Association of Community/Junior College Journal, 12-14. February/March, 1986.

Vaughan, George B. "Black Community College Presidents." Community College Review, 17:18-27. Winter, 1989.

Veenman, S. "Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers." Review of Educational Research, 54:143-178. Summer, 1984.

Veninga, Robert L. and James Spradley. The Work Stress Connection. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1981.

Vogler, Daniel E. "Inservice: Developing Faculty Strength." Community College Review, 8:35-40. Fall, 1980.

Vogt, Gloria J. "Assessment and Acquisition Methods Used By Management To Identify and Address Training and Development Needs." Ed.D. University of Nebraska, 1988.

Wallace, Richard C., Jr. "The Teacher Education Dialogue: Priming Participants for Reform." Educational Record, 67:13-17. Fall, 1986.

Washington, Earl M. "The Relationship Between College Department Chairperson's Leadership Style as Perceived by Teaching Faculty and That Faculty's Feelings of Job Satisfaction." Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1975.

Watson, Mary Alice. "A Survey of the Microcomputer Training Needs of the Faculty of the Heart of Georgia Technical Institute." Unpublished practicum, Nova University, 1988.

Weaver, Frederick Stirton. "Scholarship for the Teaching Faculty." College Teaching, 34:51-58. Spring, 1986.

Weintraub, R. "Why Presidents and Vice-Presidents Need Training and Development." Training, 15:47-51, 1978.

Weisner, Peter. "Who is Responsible for Faculty Development?" Community College Frontiers, 7:34-36. 1979.

Wergin, Jon F., Elizabeth J. Mason, and Paul J. Munson. "The Practice of Faculty Development." The Journal of Higher Education, XLVII:289-308. May/June, 1976.

Werther, William B. Jr., William A. Ruch, Lynne McClure. Productivity Through People. San Francisco: West Publishing Company, 1986.

Williams, James. M. A Study of Professional Development Practices for Part-time Instructors at Selected League of Innovation Community Colleges. ERIC ED 269 093, 1985.

Wilms, Wellford and Richard W. Moore, ed. Marketing Strategies for Changing Times. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Winter, 1987.

Wilson, Robert L. "Viewpoints: A Case for Merit Pay." Community College Frontiers, 9:25-26, 1980.

Wood, L. "Organizational Climate." In Staff Development/Organization Development. Ed. B. Dillon-Peterson. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

Woodring, Paul. "Too Bright to Be a Teacher?" Phi Delta Kappan, 68:617-618. April, 1987.

Zabezensky, Ferne, Tom Becker, Dave Bydalek, Carol Carter, and Raul Monreal. "Management Internship Program: A Model." Community College Review, 13:54-59. Winter, 1985-86.

Zemke, Ron and Thomas Kramlinger. Figuring Things Out: A Trainer's Guide to Needs and Task Analysis. Menlo Park, California: Addision-Wesley, 1988.

Zoglin, Mary Lou. Power and Politics in the Community College. Palm Springs, California: ETC Publications, 1976.

APPENDIX A

CHABOT COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT, 1988-89

General Information

Chabot College

HISTORY

Chabot College is in its twenty-seventh year of providing educational opportunities to residents of the South County Community College District.

The 1987 Autumn Quarter registration totaled 19,417 day and evening students at the Hayward campus and the Valley Campus at Livermore, the fourth highest enrollment in Chabot history. The Valley Campus, located on a 147-acre site northwest of Livermore at 3033 Collier Canyon Road, serves primarily residents of Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton and Sunol. The Hayward campus, located on a 94-acre site near the San Francisco Bay at 25555 Hesperian Boulevard in Hayward, serves residents of Alameda County in the East Bay area.

Alameda County Census estimates place the population of the district at more than 420,000. The district's 1985–86 market valuation has been set at $15,486,174,741 within its service area which includes the cities of Dublin, Hayward, Livermore, Pleasanton, San Leandro, and Union City; the communities of Ashland, Castro Valley, Mt. Eden, San Lorenzo, Sheffield Village and Sunol; and a small portion of Southern Contra Costa County. The district serves 18 public high schools and four parochial schools.

Chabot College opened its first classes September 11, 1961, on a seven-and-one-half acre temporary site in San Leandro with an enrollment of 1,163 students. The San Leandro site was Chabot's home until September 20, 1965, when the 94-acre Hayward campus was occupied. A 1,500 seat auditorium provides a host of community events, including the college sponsored Performing Arts Series of cultural programs with nationally recognized professional entertainment.

ACCREDITATION

Chabot College is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The College is also accredited by the Council on Dental Education, American Dental Association, the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation in collaboration with the American Medical Records Association and the American Medical Assisting Association. The Program in Nursing is accredited by the California Board of Registered Nursing. The College is approved by the California State Department of Education and is a member of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the California Community and Junior College Association.

Appropriate courses are fully accepted on transfer by the University of California, the state college and university system, and by private four year colleges and universities.

The College has been approved for the training of veterans and for the education of foreign students.

MISSION STATEMENT

The Mission of Chabot College is to provide educational opportunities of excellent quality to the citizens of the South County Community College District in general, occupational and transfer programs, continuing education, and basic skills. To the extent that the resources of the College will permit, the College will offer these programs, together with counseling, guidance and other educational support services and activities, and will sponsor programs to enrich the intellectual, cultural and economic life of the Community.

PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES

Chabot College has been created by the citizens of this community to provide opportunities for them to achieve through education a richer and more effective life.

It is an axiom of our democracy that Americans must be educated in a manner that will prepare them to assume the great privileges and responsibilities of self-government. We believe that citizens should have a chance to realize their highest potential as human beings. To this end, Chabot College should assist students in achieving personal freedom and in recognizing and fulfilling the responsibilities that such freedom entails. This view of the essential function of the College arises from the ideals of our American tradition.

We believe that any college worthy of the support of the citizens of the community should encourage independent and honest thought and opinion carefully and critically arrived at and should eschew all temptations to reshape principle in the interest of expediency.

We believe that an educated person possesses knowledge, proficiency, kindness, intellectual tolerance, respect for learning, and above all, the ability to utilize available resources for learning and to evaluate intelligently the many problems and issues which confront one in daily life. Such qualities can best be attained in an atmosphere where both learning and freedom to think and explore are respected, and where excellence is the standard.

We believe that college students should have the opportunity to participate actively in the educational process, make significant choices, and achieve increasing self-direction.

We believe that a college must have a creative and innovative faculty, committed to these values and encouraged to pursue them.

The community college is an educational institution providing opportunities for a diversified population with varying interests and abilities to achieve their goals. Such opportunities will be provided at Chabot College through three programs:

Technical and semiprofessional training for students who will finish their formal education at our College;

Preparation for students who plan to continue their education at four-year colleges and universities;

Continuing education for students who desire to pursue their individual interests and increase their knowledge and skills.

It is with these principles in mind that we set forth the objectives of Chabot College:

1. To assist students to become active, responsible citizens in our democratic society through a program of general liberal arts education.
2. To prepare students for employment through technical programs.
3. To prepare students for transfer, typically as juniors, to four-year colleges and universities.
4. To provide students with the basic skills needed for success in technical and transfer programs.
5. To provide students with opportunities to explore their potential abilities and interests.
6. To provide students opportunities to develop a more profound understanding of the contributions of ethnic and other cultural groups and through this heightened awareness to develop greater understanding and respect for each other.
7. To provide students with experiences out of class as well as in class which will add to their growth and intellectual development.
8. To aid students in attaining a better understanding of occupational and academic opportunities through extensive counseling and guidance.
9. To provide opportunities for employed persons to increase their job competence, to prepare for positions of increased skill and responsibility, or to extend their general education.
10. To offer the intellectual and cultural programs for the entire community.
11. To assist the economic life of the community through services to the public and to business, industry, and labor.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM, 1988-89

APPENDIX

Council Priority No. _____

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

REQUEST FOR FUNDS

1. Staff Member(s) (list all names, contact person first)_____

_____

2. Division/Department/Area_____

3. Title of Project_____

4. Project will benefit: Classified Staff /__/ Faculty /__/ Administration /__/

Hayward Campus /__/ Valley Campus /__/

5. Date(s)_____

6. Location_____

7. Sponsored by_____

8. Give brief description of project (include brochure if available):
NOTE: Use Attachment #1 if more space is needed

Objective:_____

Activities involved:_____

Expected benefit to staff development at Chabot College:_____

_____

Method of evaluation of project (evaluation and expense claim to be submitted upon completion of project):

_____

_____

9. Cost (complete Worksheet, Attachment #2)_____

Date of Request_____ Submitted by_____

Noted by Dept. Mgr._____ Department_____

Project Recommended /__/ Submitted by_____
Committee

Project Not Recommended /__/ Date_____

Priority No. _____

Project Recommended /__/ By_____
Staff Development Council

Project Not Recommended /__/ Date_____

ba

REQUEST FOR FUNDS - ATTACHMENT #1

Title of Project

Submitted by Date

8. Description (continued)

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

REQUEST FOR FUNDS - ATTACHMENT #2

COST WORKSHEET

Title of Project _____

Submitted by _____ Date _____

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT $_____
(Carry forward to #9, cover page)

Itemize all applicable costs below:

Registration _____ $_____

Program Leaders/Presenters _____ $_____
(List names, if available)

_____

_____

Project Fee _____ $_____

Materials _____ $_____

Facility _____ $_____

Equipment _____ $_____

Transportation _____ $_____

Staff Costs (substitutes and/or hourly pay for personnel) $_____

Faculty (list names, dates, classes)	Hourly Pay

Classified (list names, dates, hours)	Hourly Pay

Other Costs (explain) _____ $_____

_____ $_____

_____ $_____

_____ $_____

ba

APPENDIX C

SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 1989-90

SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

1989-90 Chabot College & Las Positas College

Code #
Category + Number
1000's faculty
2000's classified
3000's administration

Your participation in completing this questionnaire is important. The AB 1725 Staff Development Funding requires that a needs assessment survey be made within the institution for the purpose of focusing staff development activities on the needs expressed by the faculty, classified staff, and administration. The purpose of this questionnaire is to aid in determining the activities and programs that would benefit segments of the college. Individual responses are confidential.

The questionnaire is divided into five sections, A - E. It will take approximately twenty to thirty minutes to complete. Please return to the Staff Development Mailbox: **2112 at Chabot and 7 at Las Positas**

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

For each item, please circle the one response that most accurately describes you.

1. **Primary Worksite**

   a. Chabot College
   b. Las Positas College
   c. Off-site campus assignment
   d. District

2. **Type of Position**

   a. Full-time position
   b. Part-time position only
   c. Temporary position

3. **Day or Evening Assignment**

   a. Primarily day assignment
   b. Primarily evening/night assignment

4. **Classification of Position**

   a. Faculty/Counselor
   b. Faculty/Coordinator
   c. Faculty - Other
   d. Classified - Instructional Assistants
   e. Classified - Other
   f. Classified - Supervisor Division
   g. Management - Division Chairs, Directors
   h. Management - Other

5. **Years of Service in District**

   a. 0-1 c. 4-5 e. 11-15 g. 21-25
   b. 2-3 d. 6-10 f. 16-20 h. 26-and over

6. **Area of Assignment**

   a. Admission and Records
   b. Administrative Services
   c. Bookstore
   d. Business Division
   e. Business Services
   f. Counseling and Guidance
   g. Extended Opportunity Programs and Services
   h. Health Sciences Division
   i. Humanities Division
   j. Intercollegiate Athletics
   k. Language Arts Division
   l. Learning Resources
   m. Maintenance and Operations
   n. Management Information Systems
   o. Office of Instruction
   p. Personnel Services
   q. Physical Education Division
   r. Safety and Security
   s. Science and Mathematics Division
   t. Social Science Division
   u. Special Student Services
   v. Student Alumni Services
   w. Technology/Engineering
   x. Other (please specify):

7. Sex
   a. Female b. Male

8. Write in age

_____

9. Highest Certificate or Degree Earned

   a. Certificate relevant to job from a public or private school
   b. High school diploma
   c. Associate of Arts or Science degree
   d. Bachelor's degree
   e. Master's degree
   f. Doctorate
   g. None of the above

10. Prior Place of Employment

Where did (or do—for part-timers) you work at the time of being hired in the South County Community College District?

   a. at a high school, junior high, or middle school
   b. at another community college in full-time status
   c. at Chabot College, Las Positas College, or another community college in part-time status
   d. at a four-year university
   e. at a non-educational organization (public or private)
   f. at a high school or college as a student

SECTION B: ORGANIZATIONAL OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

On the scale provided, please circle the number which reflects how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

		Strongly Agree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
1.	The organization of a community college should promote an environment that encourages and facilitates the development and continuous learning of its employees as a priority in its operation in order to meet successfully its mission, goals, and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The organization of the college provides an operating environment that encourages and facilitates the professional growth and continuous learning of its employees.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	The organization of the college encourages and facilitates personnel to express concerns, input potential solutions, and to discuss matters that affect either their particular job tasks or their job within the college.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	The organization of the college provides appropriate, responsive, and timely feedback on decisions made that affect individual job tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	The organization of the college supports teamwork, collegial sharing, cooperation, and teambuilding as priorities.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION C: POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

Indicate with a check mark in the columns to the right whether or not you would participate in a staff development WORKSHOP on MEETING CHANGING INSTITUTIONAL NEEDS	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
6. Strategies to make meetings more effective and productive.				
7. Strategies for stress management, cooperation, and teambuilding.				
8. Strategies for problem solving and working with different kinds of people.				
9. Determination of division or area goals, priorities, problems.				
10. Techniques to enhance leadership and communication skills.				
11. Employee relations and new managerial theories and practices.				
12. Hiring practices and affirmative action issues: applying policies and regulations.				
13. Strategies to internationalize and multiculturalize the curriculum.				
14. Strategies for working with and within a multicultural population.				
15 Techniques for improving the retention of transfer and vocational students.				
16. Peer review programs that have worked at other California community colleges.				
DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS				
17. Presentations of experiences & findings from employees returning from a conference, Sabbatical, or Leave of Absence.				
18. Training for grant writing to develop ideas into formal action.				
19. Training on writing an article for publication or a textbook.				
20. Techniques for preparing and delivering presentations at workshops and conferences.				
21. Sharing new findings and thinking within and among subject areas.				
22. Techniques of using the DIALOG educational literature search in the Chabot LRC to investigate studies on such topics as attrition in mathematics, coping with underprepared students.				
23. Lunch or Dinner Speaker Sessions on a monthly or quarterly basis on educational or world issues.				

Indicate with a check mark in the columns to the right whether or not you would participate in a staff development WORKSHOP on	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS				
24. Computer technology applications that would facilitate operations in your work area.				
25. WordPerfect word processing.				
26. Conversion of word processing softwares from WordStar to WordPerfect.				
27. Word Processing and other applications on the MAC.				
28. Desktop Publishing softwares.				
29. Managing your paper copy and computer files.				
30. Development of slides or transparencies.				
31. Development of videos or interactive video discs.				
IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & STUDENT SERVICES				
32. Development of a quarter timeplan and a course syllabus.				
33. Methodologies on teaching a subject and on student learning.				
34. Techniques for preparing behavioral objectives for classroom activities.				
35. Strategies for increasing student motivation.				
36. Methodologies for developing critical thinking skills across the curriculum.				
37. Techniques for evaluating student writing of essays and papers across the curriculum.				
38. Strategies for promoting better study skills among students in a course.				
39. Techniques for pronouncing Asian or Middle Eastern names of our multicultural students				
40. Cultural differences of Asian and Middle Eastern countries that characterize our multicultural students				
41. Methods for improving service to and working with culturally diverse people.				
42. Approaches to help students with limited English develop better oral or written communication skills.				

Indicate with a check mark in the columns to the right whether or not you would participate in a staff development WORKSHOP on	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
43. Techniques recruiting vocational,technical, and culturally diverse students.				
44. Techniques to improve your counseling or advising effectiveness.				
45. Strategies for recognizing learning disabilities for referral.				
DEVELOPMENT OF THE WHOLE PERSON				
46. Physical fitness, wellness, and balancing your life.				
47. New findings and information about health care topics.				
48. Nutrition for a more productive and healthier life.				
Indicate with a check mark in the columns whether or not you would participate in the staff development ACTIVITY of				
49. Visitations with counterparts at UC or CSU Hayward.				
50. Visitation programs with counterparts at other community colleges to discuss common issues.				
51. Meetings with counterpart(s) at Chabot College or Las Positas College to discuss common issues.				
52. Meetings with high school counselors and faculty to market programs and to recruit students.				
53. Visits to private and public organizations to observe and learn about jobs like yours or for which you train.				
54. Business & industry in-service work programs during summer or school year.				
55. Observation of a selected colleague's class or job for ideas and techniques.				
56. Career counseling on jobs, certificates, and degrees within the district and other higher education settings.				
57. Staff Mentor Program: experienced employees work with new employees.				
58. Faculty Mentor Program: long-term faculty work with new full-time faculty.				
59. Faculty Mentor Program: long-term faculty work with part-time faculty.				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indicate with a check in the columns to the right whether or not the following items would MOTIVATE you into participating more in staff development.	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No
60. More salary incentives for participation in staff development activities.				
61. Reassigned time for classroom-related research, for the development of extensive new materials, and for development of new teaching strategies.				
62. Stipends for development of new materials related to classroom-related research, such as student follow-up studies.				
63. Tuition support for faculty retraining into a new discipline to address changing student needs.				
64. Provision of a substitute or replacement when staff development activities are occurring.				
65. Stipends and tuition payment for taking Friday night/Saturday courses to learn updating of softwares for job.				
66. A Resource Center with resource files and materials drop-in computer lab and computer assistance.				
67. Provision of a grantwriter or grant facilitator to help nurture ideas into formal action.				
68. Provision of additional funding for college personnel to attend conferences to make presentations.				
69. Allowance for scheduling classes on four weekdays to facilitate visits to local businesses or high schools on the 5th day.				
70. Leave of Absence to update skills relevant to your present job or in development of Contract Educations.				
71. Access to UC Berkeley or CSU Hayward courses in Learning Theories, Curriculum Methodology, Organizational, Management, and Assessment & Evaluations.				
72. Other (please specify):				
WORKSHOP TIMES: DEPENDING ON TYPE & LENGTH Check times you would attend.				
73. College Hour				
74. Lunch Hour				
75. Saturdays				
76. Friday Afternoons, or afternoons as can be arranged				
77. 5 to 6 p.m (generally day employees) or 5:45 p.m. to 6:45 p.m.(part-time faculty or staff)				
78. Non-instructional days between quarters or in the summer.				
79. Non-instructional days in early September before Orientation week.				

OTHER OPTION

Write your answer in the space provided at the right.

80. The present contract requires 176 days of service from faculty; the state requires 175 days. Replace classroom instruction with staff development on one day during the longest quarter of the school year. _____

81. FLEX DAYS are service days that are used for staff development activities instead of instruction. Flex Days must be bargained and arranged with the Chancellor's Office. Over 50 percent of the California Community Colleges have 2 to 15 Flex Days. Please indicate the number of Flex Days that you would like to be made available in the district. _____

SECTION D: PERSONAL ACHIEVEMENTS IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Write your answer in the space provided at the right.

1. How many conferences, instructional workshops, or technical training workshops have your attended during the past two years in which you personally paid more than two-thirds the cost? _____

2. How many conferences, instructional workshops or technical training workshops have you attended during the past two years in which the institution paid most of the cost? _____

3. How many Staff Development Council sponsored and funded activities within district have you participated in since spring, 1989? _____

4. How many community college courses on any topic have you taken for credit during the past two years? _____

5. How many university courses on any topic have you taken for credit during the past two years? _____

6. How many classroom or institutional research projects or grants have you participated in during the past two years? _____

7. How many books, articles, or papers in ERIC have you written in the past two years? _____

8. How many presentations (speeches, art shows, recitals, tournaments) have you personally done during the past two years? _____

Please check the appropriate column to indicate whether or not you have taken a university course or would like to in any of the following general areas.

	Have Taken		Would Take	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
9. Missions and Development of the Community College				
10. Management Theory and Applications				
11. Methodologies of Curriculum Development and Teaching				
12. Learning Theories and Applications				
13. Strategies for Assessing and Counseling Students				

SECTION E: COMMENTS

Comments and Suggestions: _____

If you would be willing to present a workshop on a topic, please indicate the topic and your expertise to be shared. If you are willing to provide a specific workshop, please provide your name on this sheet—or send a separate communication with the information to the Staff Development Council Mailbox.

Your Name _____

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE. The summarized data will provide information for prioritizing and implementing staff development projects beyond the 1989-90 school year.

PLEASE RETURN TO A STAFF DEVELOPMENT MAILBOX:
Chabot #2112, Las Positas, #7

APPENDIX D

SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM

1989-1990

SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Chabot and Las Positas Colleges

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL

1989-1990

Committee Number

Council Number

1. Title: _____

2. Proposer(s): _____ Work Tel. Number: _____ Noted by Supervisor: _____

3. Estimated Numbers of Participants and Classification:

_____ Faculty: Chabot _____ LPC _____ Full Time _____ +Part Time _____

_____ Classified: Chabot _____ LPC _____ Full Time _____ +Part Time _____

_____ Admin. Chabot _____ LPC _____ Full Time _____ +Part Time _____

4. Division/Department/Area to Benefit: _____

5. Date(s): _____

6. Location(s): _____

7. Cost (from page 3): $_____ Date of Request: _____

Submit all 4 pages of this proposal to the committee of each of the groups marked under #3 above.
Please check the committees to which this proposal was sent:

☐ Faculty ☐ Classified ☐ Administration

☐ Chabot College ☐ Las Positas College

RECOMMENDED BY: ☐ Chabot College CS ☐ F ☐ A ☐

☐ Las Positas College CS ☐ F ☐

NOT RECOMMENDED: ☐ Reason: _____

DATE: _____ Committee Chair: _____

RECOMMENDED: ☐ DATE: _____

NOT RECOMMENDED: ☐ Reason: _____

Council Chair: _____

Council Tracking Number: _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Project Title: _____ Page 2 of 4 pages

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL: BENEFITS TO DISTRICT

Please check the following AB 1725 categories which apply to the project:

- ☐ Improvement of teaching.
- ☐ Maintenance of current academic and technical knowledge and skills.
- ☐ Inservice training for vocational education and employment preparation programs.
- ☐ Retraining to meet changing institutional needs.
- ☐ Intersegmental exchange programs.
- ☐ Development of innovations in instructional and administrative techniques and program effectiveness.
- ☐ Computer and technological proficiency programs.
- ☐ Courses and training implementing affirmative action and upward mobility programs.
- ☐ Other activities determined to be related to educational and professional development pursuant to criteria establish the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges including, but not necessarily limited to, programs designed to develop self-esteem.

Please check the following criteria this project will meet:

- ☐ Affect a group of staff, for example a whole discipline, or a workgroup rather than individual staff members.
- ☐ Improve job performance, either directly or indirectly.
- ☐ Promote positive interaction and collaboration among classified staff , faculty, and administrators.
- ☐ Develop appreciation of the diversity of disciplines within the college, and the diversity of backgrounds and cultures of the student body, the staff, and the community.
- ☐ Involve long-term planning over short-term activities which are not part of a coherent coordinated plan
- ☐ Build upon foundations created with earlier activities. *(complete line below)*
  State what earlier activity _____

Method(s) of Evaluation of Project Activities: _____

_____

Note: Summary of evaluations, report, and expense claims must be submitted to Staff Development Coordinator at end of of project.

Project Title: _____ Page 3 of 4 pages

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL

Itemize all estimated applicable costs below. (What you indicate below will be used to budget the monies of the project that is finally accepted.)

Speaker, Consultant Fee(s) $_____

Speaker, Additional Costs (travel, etc.) $_____

List Speaker(s) and/or Organization to Provide Service: (*if available*)

_____

Faculty Consultants/Presenters $_____

List Faculty Consultants/presenters (*if available*)

_____

Materials Production (notices, handouts) $_____

Program/Operating Supplies $_____

Refreshments (off campus) $_____

Facility: _____ $_____

Equipment: Rental ____ Purchase ____ $_____

Transportation for Employees $_____

Travel/Conference \ Destination: _____ $_____

Other: _____ $_____

_____

Sub Total $_____

. . . . . .

	Number	Cost/hour	Total
Part-time Faculty	_____	x$_____.___	=$_____
Faculty Substitutes	_____	x$_____.___	=$_____
Part-time Classified	_____	x$_____.___	=$_____
Classified Substitutes	_____	x$_____.___	=$_____

Sub Total $_____

Estimated Total Cost of Project: $_____
(Carry over to page 1, #7)

Project Title: _____ Page 4 of 4 pages

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL

Objectives and Rationale: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Activities Involved: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Names of Staff Participants (if known): _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

For help in filling out this form, contact the Staff Development Coordinator or any member of the Staff Development Council.

Cough: 8/10/89 Proform.1ws

APPENDIX E

MISSION, PHILOSOPHY, AND OBJECTIVES OF LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT

The Mission of Las Positas College is to provide excellent educational opportunities to individuals who seek to increase their knowledge, improve their skills, and enhance their lives by enrolling in programs or courses for career and transfer, general education, continuing education, basic skills, and enrichment. Sensitive to the aesthetic and professional needs of its local constituencies, the college offers these programs together with assessment, counseling, guidance, and other educational support services and activities dedicated to nurturing student success. The college utilizes its resources to provide programs sensitive to the demands of rapidly changing technology and organizational systems, to increasingly culturally diverse populations, and to the internationalization of intellectual and artistic achievement, enabling students to improve both the ethical and humanistic tenets of their world and the quality of their lives.

LAS POSITAS PHILOSOPHY

We, the faculty, staff, and administrators of Las Positas College, support the basic democratic tenets that all individuals be afforded opportunity to reach their highest human potential as responsible members of society and that all individuals be given an equal opportunity to prepare themselves to assume the privileges and responsibilities of self-governance in a world of diverse philosophical values and political practices.

STANDARD 1: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

We believe that the qualities of an educated person include knowledge, competency, mental and physical well-being, concern for the ecology, and respect for the dignity of diverse peoples and cultures.

We offer students the opportunity to participate actively in the educational process, to make significant choices, and to achieve increasing self-direction in an atmosphere in which the freedom to create and to explore ideas is encouraged and supported.

We also encourage and support creativity and innovation among faculty, staff, and administrators whose values reflect those of the community and whose presence and leadership serve as models for students.

We support an environment that provides educational programs, learning resources, and student services to a culturally rich and diverse student population. We are sensitive to students with varying needs, interests, physical abilities, and learning differences or difficulties.

OBJECTIVES

Based upon our philosophy, the Board of Governors agenda, and the community college mission as outlined in the legislation, we identify the following as our primary objectives for Las Positas College:

- *To provide the community with an excellent learning and teaching environment, helping students to achieve fulfilling and productive lives, both mentally and physically;*
- *To provide life-long learning opportunities for all members of our community to enhance their understanding and appreciation of general education, cultural experiences, and self-enrichment;*
- *To assist students through the process of matriculation, counseling, and guidance so they may have a better understanding of educational and career opportunities;*
- *To provide basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics;*
- *To provide language programs for non-native speakers of English;*
- *To prepare students for employment through career-vocational education programs;*
- *To prepare students for transfer to four-year colleges and universities;*
- *To provide students with curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences to enhance their social and intellectual growth and to help them become active, responsible individuals in our democratic society;*
- *To provide continuing education that develops job-related knowledge and skills to meet changes in technology and the workplace;*
- *To provide opportunities to develop an understanding of the contributions of an increasingly heterogeneous society, and through this awareness to develop a greater understanding and respect for one another;*
- *To sustain strong cooperative working relationships with local school districts and other institutions of higher learning;*
- *To contribute to the political and economic life of the community through cooperative working partnerships with business, industry, and government.*

APPENDIX F

RESPONSES FROM STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION E: PART 1

Responses from Section E: Part 1

Classified Staff made the following comments.

1. Classified Staff Member in Counseling and Guidance: Staff development for classified employees is totally inadequate. Many classified employees have advanced college degrees, and the contract staff development programs are geared to help employees attain A.A. degrees. The caste system of Classified vs. Certificated is appalling and entirely inappropriate in the 20th Century. (Two other classified staff expressed a similar viewpoint.)

2. Instructional Assistant: My focus and coursework has been in Instructional Technology. I would like to study/know more about learning theories and apply that research with technology use with students.

3. Instructional Assistant: I would like reliable, clear information that would help me go from Instructional Assistant into either teaching or counseling.

4. Classified Staff from Maintenance and Operations: Senior Staff (management) has maintained control through restrictive rules that most often prevent employees from participating in staff development activities.

5. Instructional Assistant: Many of the topics [in the questionnaire] sound very interesting. I hope that they can be offered at times other than 9-5, as I find it difficult to be away from my worksite too often.

6. Classified Staff Member from Admission and Records: I would like to attend more workshops to improve the quality of my work. (3 comments)

7. Classified Staff Member from Admission and Records: How bout a two- to three-day retreat for the classified, such as taken by administrators and counselors?

8. Classified Staff Member from Office of Instruction: I prefer off-campus workshops; it is easier to become involved and interested in what is taking place "there and then" instead of being distracted by things that were happening in the workplace.

9. The classified staff should be able to attend more workshops!! (7 similar comments from various areas.)

10. There needs to be more computer training. (4 comments)

11. A specially designed questionnaire needs to be sent to Maintenance and Operations personnel (3 comments) and to Bookstore staff (1 comment).

Part-time faculty provided the following comments.

1. The incentives on page 6 figure greatly into deciding to participate in workshops.

2. Part-time instructors in English have to put in so much time related to class preparation that it is simply not fair to expect them to spend hours in workshops, etc. without paying them.

3. I eagerly support anything that supports teamwork and an inter-division focus toward goals, mission

statements, and teaching strategies. As a new part-timer, I have not had the opportunity to talk with other instructors in my division . . . not one staff meeting. (2 similar comments)

4. As a part-time instructor, I don't know how this [staff development] fits in. (2 similar comments)

5. I would like a workshop on motivating students who have extremely limited experience in making personal decisions which affect their own lives.

6. I live too far away and have too little time to participate in such activities. (5 comments)

7. I've participated in some workshops offered to part-time and suggest that they be more in-depth.

8. I would appreciate a workshop designed to improve teaching skills. (3 comments)

9. Part-time faculty should be invited, even if not paid, to division meetings, scheduling meetings, and other important gatherings. (4 comments)

10. I work for a large corporation in the training department and attend training and conferences through it.

11. As a part-timer, I have not been advised of any staff development opportunities.

12. I don't know how this affects me. (4 comments)

Full-time faculty contributed the following comments.

1. We need a workshop on the syllabus requirement in our contract. (2 comments)

2. I like the idea of having a specific person to coordinate staff development requests and activities.

3. I belong to two national organizations which are very important to my performance of duties. I believe that the district should be responsible for the financial assistance of these endeavors.

4. More encouragement for reassigned time needs to be offered for development of course materials.

5. Faculty need to be given training in hiring and affirmative action guidelines.

6. I support workshops that allow staff throughout campus to share methodologies, retention methods, etc.

7. Chabot seems to have little opportunity or priority for what makes effective teaching and how to do it. With a diversifying student population, many curricula and methods applied years ago don't work as well now.

8. We've needed a [needs assessment] study. (15 comments)

9. I couldn't possibly attend as many of the interests that I checked on pages 3-5.

10. I believe strongly that instructors are responsible for updating skills in their <u>academic areas</u>. I believe this is part of the contract. The college can facilitate faculty updating by making funds available for conferences. (2 similar comments)

11. There is nothing in this survey that allows me to indicate the substantial amounts of time and energy which I

put into researching new and related areas to my teaching and subject specialty.

12. Presently very little research and evaluation has been done at Chabot or Las Positas colleges. We need to begin such research.

13. AB 1725 funds are a godsend. Without them SCCCD would still be in the Stone Age in terms of developing faculty.

14. There is a need for a computer center for faculty and staff where hardware and software can be learned and used. (6 comments)

15. There is a need for increased conference funding. (3 comments)

APPENDIX G

RESPONSES FROM STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION E: PART 2

Responses from Section E: Part 2

1. Computer Use in Science
2. Positions/Careers in Justice
3. Interpersonal Relationships
4. Study Skills
5. Leadership Development and Teambuilding
6. Multicultural Sensitivity in Working With Students
7. Usage of Library Computers for Accessing Media
8. Learning Styles and Left/Right Brain Preference
9. Aging in the 21st Century: It Impact on Career and Vocational Preparation
10. Learning Skills, Memory Development, Learning Strategies.
11. DIAGLOG searches for relevant literature
12. Desktop Publishing (2 offers)
13. Direct Marketing and Managing a Direct Mail Project
14. Classroom Interaction Strategies for Teachers to Apply as Alternatives to the Old Lecture/Test'em Routine
15. Use of the IBM PC
16. Weight Training
17. Strategic Planning
18. Legal Aspects of Health Care Issues
19. Preventing Faculty Burnout
20. Aids and the College Campus
21. Developing Peer Support
22. Women-related Issues

23. Myers-Briggs TemperAment Inventory

24. Asian Names

25. Visual Arts as a Format

26. Computer Graphics in the Classroom

27. Health, Fitness and Nutrition

28. How to Make an Effective Presentation

29. How the Computer Controls the Automobile

30. The Anatomy and Physiology of the Voice. Voice Techniques for the Uninitiated.

31. Using Statistical Software

32. Techniques of Information Battering

33. Using Writing in the Classroom

34. Preparing Questionnaires

35. Self-paced, Mastery Learning Systems

36. Grant Writing

37. Teaching Adult Learners

38. Ethnic Identity of Third and Fourth World People

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF STUDENT

Carol E. Clough was born in Bremerton, Washington during World War II, the daughter of Roy Eugene and Vera Iverson Clough. She attended California schools in Walnut Creek and graduated from Santa Rosa High School in 1960.

Ms. Clough received her Bachelor of Science in January, 1964 from the University of California at Berkeley. Partially funded by a California Real Estate Scholarship, she earned her Masters of Business Administration degree in 1965 from U.C. Berkeley. Since that time, she has worked in and consulted for businesses, usually in the accounting and office administration areas.

Having taught World History and United States History at Alexander Hamilton Junior High in Stockton for one semester, she was inducted into junior college teaching at Bakersfield College, 1967. She was selected Business Division Chair in 1969 and served for two years. She married a Stockton businessman in 1971 and worked at Modesto Junior College for six years.

Ms. Clough moved to Chabot College - Valley Campus, now Las Positas College, in 1977 where she developed forty-three mastery learning courses for office training and provided word processing training to numerous Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory employees. She has served as Faculty Senate President for both Chabot campuses and worked on the collective bargaining agent's executive board three years. She is Staff Development Coordinator for the district.